

# GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

DESCRIPTIVE INDEX & BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. TILNEY BASSETT

## MIDLOTHIAN EDUCATION AUTHORITY

### COUNTY LIBRARIES

READERS are requested to take great care of the books while in their possession. If a book is found to be damaged on its return to the Library, the Reader in whose name it was issued will make good such damage.

Fourteen days are allowed for reading each volume. A fine of twopence will be charged for every week or part of a week it is kept beyond that period.

Should Infectious Disease occur in the home of a Reader, the book **must not** be returned to the Library. Report the matter to the Librarian, who will give instructions as to its disposal.

No. 53368 Class 825

FORM No. 97.

53368

Shelf 1

1 copy

Form No. 98.

MIDLOTHIAN  
COUNTY LIBRARIES

This Book is due to be returned to  
the Library on:—


THE NOW

14 NOV

MELOTHIAN COURSE LIBRARY  
WITHDRAWN



**GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES**



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation

# GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

DESCRIPTIVE INDEX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BY  
ARTHUR TILNEY BASSETT

53368  
825

WITH A PREFACE BY  
VISCOUNT BRYCE, O.M.

AND INTRODUCTIONS TO THE SELECTED SPEECHES BY  
HERBERT PAUL



METHUEN & CO., LTD.  
36 ESSEX STREET, W.C.  
LONDON

# GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

DISCUSSIVE AND VINDICATIVE

ARTHUR JAMES BARRATT

*First Published in 1916*

WILLIAM & WILKINSON  
10, MARK LANE, E.C. 3  
LONDON

## PREFACE

**T**HERE is in English history no Statesman of the first rank whose active career covers so long a period as does that of Mr. Gladstone. He entered public life at twenty-three as a member of the House of Commons and at twenty-five as an official. He quitted it at eighty-five, being then, and that for the fourth time, Prime Minister. For forty-two years, from 1852 till 1894, he was one of the most prominent political figures in the country, and from 1866 onwards by far the most eminent man in his own party, even during the five years in which he had, by his own wish, ceased to be formally its leader.

An impression of the wide range and endless variety of the questions with which he dealt may be gathered from the list of his speeches prefixed to this volume. They cover almost the whole field of politics. Most of them were delivered while he held high office, and all the later, those made since he entered Sir Robert Peel's Cabinet in 1843, under the responsibility which attaches to whoever has held such office and is likely to hold it again.

These speeches are therefore invaluable materials for the political history of the period they cover, and will have to be constantly consulted by whoever attempts to describe that period. There are, however, some—indeed a considerable number—of them which stand out from the rest in respect of the magnitude and permanent significance of the issues with which they deal; and these are naturally also among the speeches of most merit in respect of substance and diction, because the speaker put the most and the best of his thought into them and rose with the greatness of his theme.

From among this considerable number of important speeches the fourteen which have been selected and placed together in this volume are all of high interest both as pieces of history and also as typical of Mr. Gladstone's oratorical manner and style. All are concerned with great affairs. All display his wonderful

gift for bringing together and marshalling in a convincing array a great mass of facts and arguments drawn from many sources, and while four are addressed to domestic issues, important at the moment but now of slighter significance, the remaining ten cover between them three branches of policy with which he was most deeply concerned and in which the effect of his action was most momentous, viz., the principles of financial administration, the relations of Ireland to Great Britain, and Foreign policy.

Neither from these nor from any of his speeches as read in print will a reader derive a full impression of his oratorical gifts or be able to understand the effect which his eloquence produced on his hearers. Demosthenes is reported to have said that in public speaking Delivery was the first merit, and the second merit, and the third merit. Such a saying would well apply to Mr. Gladstone, not that his speeches would not remain instructive and persuasive if they were read aloud by any schoolboy, but that they gained so much by the way in which he delivered them as to seem very different when perused next morning from what they had seemed when listened to overnight. Much is inevitably lost even in the best report. The voice is lost, and his was rich, sonorous and exquisitely modulated in its tones. The aspect of the speaker is lost, with the grace and variety of his gesture and the flashing glance of his eye. And it was only in watching him as he spoke that one received a due impression of the easy power he showed in dealing with any interruption that came from the audience, or in following up on the spur of the moment some line or argument suggested by expressions of assent or dissent. His readiness was amazing. Those of us who listened to him in Parliament used to think that the short speeches he made on the spur of the moment when some question arose suddenly in debate, revealed the swiftness of his mind and the combative force of his whole nature better than did the more elaborate discourses on which he had reflected beforehand. There was a fire, a passion, a concentrated energy of diction, in these extempore outbursts which roused his followers and cowed his opponents as the set speeches hardly could. No one had less need for preparation. I remember how on the afternoon of May 7, 1877, I called on him at his house in Harley Street (by his request) between three and four in the afternoon, and found him just sitting down, to put together, as he told me, a few notes for a speech—it proved to be a long and very striking speech—which he delivered a little later in the House of Commons on the Eastern

Question.\* He asked me about some facts as to which he was imperfectly informed—talked about the subject generally in a leisurely way, and cannot have had between the time when he turned again to his notes and his departure for Westminster more than half an hour for the composition of one of the most brilliant and impressive deliverances of his whole career. I recall another occasion on which he lost altogether the use of such notes as he had prepared by having forgotten to bring his eye-glasses with him. But the speech did not seem to suffer ; he was as self-possessed and as fully master of the subject as if all the points he meant to refer to had lain in writing before him.

Though his speeches read in print do not convey a due impression of his oratorical gifts or of that charm of delivery which made listening to them a pleasure, to whatever length they might run, they do show forth three of the rare and admirable qualities which placed upon him the stamp of true greatness.

They are marked by a singular absence of bitterness. Indignation there often is—burning indignation at injustice, falsehood or cruelty—but no personal acrimony, no note of malignity or vindictiveness. No man ever inflicted fewer wounds in controversy. In the debate of June, 1866, which destroyed his Reform Bill of that year and threw out the Government, a hostile Amendment had been moved by one of his own supporters. While he was replying, a friend behind put in his hand a slip of paper reminding him of an incident in the career of the mover which might have been used damagingly against him. Mr. Gladstone looked at it, but went on steadily with his speech. When he had sat down, he turned round to the friend and said, “ I thought several times over the note you gave me, but concluded that it would be rather hard upon —— to refer to the incident, though it could easily have been brought in.”

These speeches—indeed all his greater speeches—also show that vast store not only of knowledge, but of political thought which belonged to him. One feels that his eye ranges over an immense landscape and gathers ideas from the most remote and diverse quarters to apply it to the solution of the problem in hand. The sense which the reader obtains of the wealth of learning and experience on which the speaker is drawing, gives singular attractiveness even to the less remarkable among his discourses. One feels how much there is behind. If I mistake not, Mr. Gladstone's intellectual tastes spread themselves over a

\* It is printed in this volume.

wider field than those of any other first-rate practical statesman since 1688, for they embraced not only literature, scholarship and history, which Bolingbroke and Burke, Fox, the two Pitts, Canning and Peel, and to a certain extent Lord Derby also, had cultivated, but they extended themselves no less to theology and ecclesiastical affairs, in which none of these illustrious predecessors took any keen interest. He stands almost alone among our statesmen in this restless intellectual curiosity, reaching eagerly out to nearly every subject except natural science. No better proof of this could be given than is furnished by the excellent bibliography prefixed to this volume, and containing a list of all his writings, articles in periodicals, pamphlets and books, from 1838 down till 1898, the year of his death. One is amazed to find that so much literature can have flowed from the pen of a man who was always busy with politics and for nearly half of his later life the holder of some laborious office.

And thirdly, these speeches bear witness to the habitual elevation of his mind. His arguments may be sometimes finedrawn or oversubtle. They are never petty or niggling. He is like an eagle soaring high in the air and seeing the far-off things as well as the near things, and seeing them all in truer relation to one another than the man standing on the ground can see them. In following his thoughts one feels in particular the power he possesses of testing views and proposals by permanent moral standards. To him the ethical values were always the real and final values, and moral principles the true searchlight to be turned on every question.

One other observation needs to be made regarding some of the political doctrines embodied in these speeches. Those doctrines, and especially the courage with which he announced them at a time when they were novel and unpopular, are a testimony both to his independence and to his foresight. In saying this, I refer particularly to the speech with which he introduced the Home Rule Bill in 1886 and to the two speeches which record his views on the Eastern Question. It is still too soon to pass judgment on the whole policy of Home Rule and the prospect it offers of establishing permanently friendly relations between the peoples of these two islands. That must be left to the future. But Mr. Gladstone's action in taking up the idea and giving it a practical character has been so far vindicated by the thirty years that have passed since 1886. Through many changes and reverses, the policy has held its ground as the solution which the Irish party

and one of the two great British parties continues to recommend. It has now passed into law, and nobody suggests that it can be repealed. There have been and still are many troubles in Ireland, but the mass of the people have stood by their constitutional leaders, and few can doubt that these latest troubles, partly due to the excitement of the present war and other causes too familiar to need dwelling upon, would have taken a far graver form but for the fact that what Mr. Gladstone sought to do in 1886 had been done in 1914.\*

Ten years before the Home Rule proposal divided the Liberal party, Mr. Gladstone's judgment and patriotism had been almost as generally and as bitterly attacked. That was when in 1876 he entered on his famous campaign on behalf of the Eastern Christians. In those days the Turk was still "our ancient ally," and Russia "our inevitable enemy." He first broke the bad tradition, imperilling his own influence, but not hesitating for a moment to follow the call of conscience and duty. It was also the call of wisdom. How amply has that wisdom been approved by the history of the last forty years! Had Lord Beaconsfield's counsels prevailed, there would have been a war between Britain and Russia for the sake of preserving the most detestable and incompetent government the modern world has seen. Had Mr. Gladstone's counsels, which did prevail so far as to prevent that threatened war, been followed out in all their fullness, that lamentable blunder by which the Treaty of San Stefano was set aside and the Treaty of Berlin substituted for it, would have been avoided. To that fatal substitution which put Macedonia and Thrace back under the Turk, there may be traced all the subsequent miseries of South-Eastern Europe, the thirty years of anarchy and cruelty in Macedonia, the two Balkan Wars, the German grip upon Turkey, the desola-

\* Another instance in which time has done much to vindicate Mr. Gladstone's judgment may be mentioned here, because it was the occasion for the speech on the Irish University question printed in this volume. The solution of that long vexed problem which he proposed, and which was defeated by a singular combination of Irish bishops and a group of English Radicals with the regular Tory Opposition, will, I think, be deemed by those who study it to-day a better solution than any that has ever been brought into Parliament, or than that which was passed into law in 1908. I believe I am right in thinking that Mr. Fawcett, who led the group of philosophical Radicals that turned the scale against Mr. Gladstone's plan in 1873, said some years later that he regretted the course then taken and wished the Bill had passed.

tion of Armenia and Syria. Every page of the history of the Near East since 1878 bears witness to that insight, for it was insight as well as sympathy, which prompted the speeches of 1877 and 1878. But not till these last four years has the world come to see the full measure of his foresight.

Two other instances of what his love of liberty and his love of peace stirred him to do for the world ought not to pass unmentioned, though neither of them is connected with the speeches in this collection. He was the first leading Englishman to win for the sufferers in the cause of Italian freedom the sympathy of the Western nations. He was the statesman who brought to a close the differences with America which had arisen out of the Civil War, and made possible a better feeling between the nations than had ever existed before. Little credit was given to him at the time for either of these services, any more than for his action in the Eastern Question. But History will not forget them.

*October, 1916*

BRYCE.

# CONTENTS

## PART I

### DESCRIPTIVE INDEX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

	PAGE
LIST OF SPEECHES DELIVERED BY THE RT. HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., 1833-1898 . . . . .	3
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	91

## PART II

### SELECTED SPEECHES

LORD PALMERSTON'S FOREIGN POLICY (June 27, 1850) . . .	109
SPEECH ON DISRAELI'S BUDGET (December 16, 1852) . . .	155
THE FIRST BUDGET (April 18, 1853) . . . . .	182
THE COMMERCIAL TREATY (February 10, 1860) . . . . .	253
TAXATION OF CHARITIES (May 4, 1863) . . . . .	312
THE REFORM BILL OF 1866 : REPLY AT THE END OF THE DEBATE ON THE SECOND READING (April 27, 1866) . . . . .	342
IRISH CHURCH BILL : REPLY ON THE SECOND READING (March 23, 1869) . . . . .	380
SPEECH ON ADMINISTRATIVE ECONOMY AT BLACKHEATH (October, 1871) . . . . .	401
IRISH UNIVERSITY BILL (February 13, 1873) . . . . .	426
THE EASTERN QUESTION (May 7, 1877) . . . . .	470
THE TREATY OF BERLIN (July 30, 1878) . . . . .	505
THE MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN : OPENING SPEECH (November 25, 1879)	553
THE OATHS BILL (April 26, 1883) . . . . .	580
THE FIRST HOME RULE BILL (April 8, 1886) . . . . .	601
INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS . . . . .	645



# GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

## PART I

### DESCRIPTIVE INDEX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY



SPEECHES DELIVERED BY THE RT. HON.  
W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

1833-1898.

IN view of the extent of time covered by Mr. Gladstone's public career and the consequent difficulty of referring to his many utterances in and out of parliament, it occurred to the Gladstone Trustees that a record of them, which might prove of use to students of history and politics, should be prepared and in furtherance of this object access was given to the vast collection of documents in the Muniment Room at Hawarden. The following list has been the result, and as it was thought advisable that it should begin from the date of Mr. Gladstone's first speech in the House of Commons, it may not be out of place to give some particulars of his earlier efforts. How far one ought to go back in collecting such records it is difficult to decide, more especially in view of the fact that Mr. Gladstone's memory carried him to a period when, at the age of two years and ten months, on the occasion of a visit to his father's house by Mr. Canning, he delivered what he afterwards described as his first speech. This effort apparently was limited to the opening words "Ladies and Gentlemen." From this date until his election to the Eton Debating Society, more commonly known as "Pop," in 1825 is no great span. A record, written by James Milnes-Gaskell, of his maiden speech to the Society still exists. "Mr. Gladstone rose and eloquently addressed the house in favour of education," it runs, and in a later debate the youthful orator, who at the time had not reached his eighteenth birthday, is reported as saying, "I am well aware that my prejudices and predilections have long been enlisted on the side of Toryism."

In 1828 Eton was succeeded by Oxford There he founded an

Essay Club which was known by his initials, as the "W. E. G.," and the minutes of which are still preserved in the Muniment Room at Hawarden. The discussions at the "W. E. G." soon gave place to the more public debates of the Union of which he later became successively Secretary and President. Here he made his maiden speech on February 11, 1830, and on May 17 of the following year in a speech against the Reform Bill of 1831 he first gave convincing proofs of his powers as an orator. Of the speech itself Charles Wordsworth said, "It was the most striking speech, out and out, that was ever heard in our Society"; whilst another who heard it has stated, "We all of us felt that an epoch in our lives had occurred. It certainly was the finest speech of his that I ever heard." There seems little reason to doubt that an indirect result of this speech was his being asked to contest Newark in the following year, and thus it was intimately connected with the most momentous turning point in his career. Many years later, in the debate on the Reform Bill of 1866, Disraeli taunted its deliverer on his utterance, and Mr. Gladstone's scathing reply is well known.

During the Newark contest various speeches, some of which may be read by the curious in the *Nottingham Journal* of the day, were delivered. Of these, perhaps the utterance of December 4, 1832, attracted most attention. Mr. Gladstone's first speech as a candidate for parliament was made on October 8, 1832, and his first address after the election was given on December 13 in the same year. From that date until his appearance in the House of Commons only one public speech at Nottingham—on Lord Lincoln's election to Parliament—seems to have been made, and we are thus brought to the beginning of the greatest parliamentary career in history.

The compilation of the following list, intended, as it is, to include all the utterances of one of the most prolific of speakers and of one whose range of subjects had no limit, has been attended with no little difficulty, and it would be too much to hope that no discerning critic may detect a flaw in it. As will be seen, the subject matter of each speech has been given, together with the name of the place in which it was delivered, and in the case of parliamentary speeches the approximate length of the report in *Hansard* has been added, and it is hoped that this material, together with the index which accompanies it, will be of assistance to the political student.

Statisticians may be interested to learn that Mr. Gladstone's parliamentary utterances are scattered through no less than 366 volumes of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates and fill some 15,000 columns of print—a record which is never likely to be surpassed.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1833. June 3	Slavery Abolition Bill . . .	House of Commons	7	Mr. Gladstone's maiden speech in the House of Commons. Various authorities have given February 21, 1833, as the date of this effort; but there is conclusive evidence to prove that the speaker on that day was his brother Thomas (afterwards Sir Thomas) Gladstone, then member for Portarlington.
July 4	Liverpool Election Petition . . .	Do.	5	
" 8	Church Reform (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	2	
" 25	Slavery (Negro Apprenticeship) . . .	Do.	—	
" 29	Do. . .	Do.	—	
" Feb. 28	Sugar Duties . . .	Do.	—	
1834. Mar. 12	Bill disenfranchizing Liverpool Freemen Do.	Do.	—	
" 19	Lord's Day Observance Bill . . .	Do.	1	
May 5	Universities' Admission Bill . . .	Do.	—	
July 28	Education in the Colonies . . .	Do.	5	
Feb. 27	Colonial Passengers Bill . . .	Do.	1	
1835. Mar. 19	Irish Church . . .	Do.	2	
" 31	Ireland . . .	Do.	7	
June 11	Municipal Corporations Bill . . .	Newark		
July 20	Liverpool and Bribery . . .	Do.	—	
" 20	Supplies . . .	Do.	—	
Aug. 21	Negro Apprenticeship . . .	Do.	4	
1836. Mar. 22	Estimates . . .	Do.	4	
May 30	Tithes and Church (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	1	
June 1			1	

v. Spencer Walpole, Vol. III, p. 421.

On the conduct of the Peers.

Oct. 18	Political Situation	.	.	.	.	Liverpool	(Liverpool Tradesmen's Conservative Association.)
" 21	Do.	.	.	.	.	Do.	(Liverpool Operatives' Conservative Association.)
1837. Jan. 13	Do.	.	.	.	.	Glasgow	(Peel Banquet.) Attacked "reckless wickedness" of O'Connell.
" 17	Do.	.	.	.	.	Newark	
Mar. 8	Canada	.	.	.	.	House of Commons	<i>v.</i> Greville Memoirs, Mar. 18, 1887.
" 15	Church Rates	.	.	.	.	Do.	
April 21	Poor Law	.	.	.	.	Newark	
July 5	Kaffir War	.	.	.	.	House of Commons	
" 10	Abduction of an Elector	.	.	.	.	Do.	
Aug. 9	Public Affairs	.	.	.	.	Manchester	
Dec. 22	Canada	.	.	.	.	House of Commons	
1838. Jan. 22	Do.	.	.	.	.	Do.	<i>v.</i> Greville Memoirs, Dec. 24, 1837.
" 23	Do.	.	.	.	.	Do.	
Mar. 7	Do. (Colonial Administration)	.	.	.	.	Do.	
" 30	Negro Apprenticeship	.	.	.	.	Do.	
April 7	Abolition of Slavery	.	.	.	.	Do.	
June 20	New Zealand	.	.	.	.	Do.	Long speech in defence of West Indian sugar planters. <i>v.</i> Greville Memoirs.
July 10	Cape of Good Hope	.	.	.	.	Do.	
" 13	Prisons	.	.	.	.	Do.	
" 23	Do.	.	.	.	.	Do.	Against appointment of dissenting chaplains.
" 30	Maynooth	.	.	.	.	Do.	Opposing Grant.
1839. April 9	Jamaica	.	.	.	.	Do.	[stitution.
May 6	Do.	.	.	.	.	Do.	Against suspension of the Con-
June 10	Do.	.	.	.	.	Do.	
" 20	Education.	.	.	.	.	Do.	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1840.				
April 8	Chinese War . . . . .	House of Commons	21	Denounces Opium traffic.
May 29	Canada . . . . .	Do.	8	
June 15	Clergy Reserves (Canada) Bill . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 25	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	6	Opposes Bill.
" 29	Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill do.	Do.	9	
July 20	Do.	Do.	3	
" 27	Chinese War and Opium Traffic. . . . .	Do.	8	
Sept. 18	Religious Education . . . . .	Liverpool		Against reduction of duty on foreign sugar. <i>v.</i> Greville Memoirs. <i>v.</i> Spencer Walpole, Vol. IV, p. 120. Introduces a Bill for the better regulation of railways. Reply to Lord John Russell's attack on the Government.
1841.	Corn Laws . . . . .	Walsall	1	
Jan. 20	East India Rum . . . . .	House of Commons	7	
Mar. 12	Jewish Disabilities . . . . .	Do.	20	
" 31	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	4	
May 10				
1842.				
Feb. 8	Colonial Trade . . . . .	Do.	11	
" 8	Railways . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 14	Corn Laws . . . . .	Do.	32	On preferential duties for Colonial goods.
" 25	Do.	Do.	11	
" 28	Do.	Do.	11	
Mar. 9	Do. (Importation Bill) . . . . .	Do.	13	
" 16	Copyright . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 16	Corn Laws (Importation Bill) . . . . .	Do.	5	
April 5	Colonial Customs Duties Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 15	Colonial Customs Duties Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
May 10	Customs Act—Tariff . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 13	Do.	Do.	9	
" 20	Merchants and Factors Bill . . . . .	Do.	2	Importation of live cattle.
" 23	Customs Act—Tariff . . . . .	Do.	16	

25	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	3	Importation of ores.
27	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	2	Importation of timber.
June 3	Sugar Duties	.	.	.	Do.	17	
" 6	Customs Act—Tariff	.	.	.	Do.	6	Do.
" 14	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	3	Export duty on coal.
" 18	Railways	.	.	.	Do.	2	
" 28	Customs Act—Tariff	.	.	.	Do.	1	Importation of foreign corn.
July 7	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	6	
" 20	Bonded Corn Bill	.	.	.	Do.	3	
Aug. 2	Designs Copyright Bill	.	.	.	Do.	3	
" 6		.	.	.	Liverpool		
1843. Feb. 13	Distress of the Country	.	.	.	House of Commons	29	Inaugural address at Collegiate Institute, Liverpool.
Mar. 31	Watch-making by Machinery	.	.	.	Do.	3	Important speech on the Corn Law.
April 25	Import Duties—Commercial Treaties	.	.	.	Do.	10	Opposes motion for immediate free trade.
May 9	Abolition of the Corn Laws	.	.	.	Do.	27	Against the immediate abolition of the Corn Laws.
" 19	Canada Corn Law	.	.	.	Do.	15	Supports reduction of duty.
June 12	Export Duties on Coal	.	.	.	Do.	10	
" 13	Abolition of the Corn Laws	.	.	.	Do.	16	Against a fixed duty on imported corn.
" 22	Sugar Duties	.	.	.	Do.	5	
July 4	Stade Tolls	.	.	.	Do.	6	
Aug. 1	Coal Whippers Bill	.	.	.	Do.	5	
" 5	Customs Bill	.	.	.	Do.	4	
" 7	Import Duties	.	.	.	Do.	2	
" 10	Exportation of Machinery	.	.	.	Do.	13	Moves second reading of the Bill.
1844. Feb. 5	Railways	.	.	.	Do.	8	Motion for a select committee.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1844. Feb. 6	Railways . . . . .	House of Commons	2	
Mar. 4	Do. . . . .	Do.	5	
" 7	Brazil . . . . .	Do.	20	Slave trade and commercial relations with Brazil.
" 12	Protective Duties—Agricultural Interest	Do.	14	Reply to Mr. Cobden's speech.
" 19	Commercial Treaties . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 26	Colonial Corn . . . . .	Do.	7	Opposes extension of low duty.
April 2	Law of Partnership . . . . .	Do.	4	Outlines provisions of Joint Stock Companies Regulation Bill.
" 18	Agricultural Statistics	Do.	3	
May 17	State of the Coopers . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 17	Customs Duties . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 18		Eton		Anniversary dinner.
" 20	Railways . . . . .	House of Commons	3	
June 3	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	18	
" 6	Dissenters' Chapels Bill	Do.	14	
" 14	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	9	
" 20	Do. . . . .	Do.	5	
" 25	Abolition of Corn Laws	Do.	14	
July 3	Joint Stock Companies	Do.	3	Opposes motion by Mr. Villiers.
" 8	Railways . . . . .	Do.	29	
" 22	Do. . . . .	Do.	4	
" 23	Navigation Laws—Russia	Do.	2	
" 23	Quarantine . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 30	Coopers' Trade . . . . .	Do.	1	
Aug. 5	Consolidation Bills . . . . .	Do.	3	Introduces three bills for the regulation of private bill procedure.
" 6	Railways . . . . .	Do.	2	

1845. Feb.	4	Address in answer to Queen's Speech.	Do.	5	Personal explanation of retirement from Cabinet.
"	5	Railways . . . . .	Do.	1	Second reading of Maynooth College Bill.
"	6	Do. . . . .	Do.	4	
"	17	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
"	24	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	7	
"	26	Do. . . . .	Do.	21	
Mar.	3	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
"	7	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
"	13	Railways . . . . .	Do.	1	
April	8	Agricultural Statistics . . . . .	Do.	2	
"	11	Maynooth . . . . .	Do.	33	
"	17	Do. . . . .	Do.	1	Supports Bill.
"	21	Standing Orders . . . . .	Do.	3	
June	2	Academical Institutions (Ireland)	Do.	9	
July	7	Do. . . . .	Do.	2	
"	15	Spanish Treaties and Colonial Sugar <sup>2</sup> .	Do.	35	
Dec.	8	Roman Catholic Relief Bill . . . . .	Do.	7	
"	13	New Zealand . . . . .	Do.	5	
"	16	Disabilities of the Jews . . . . .	Do.	22	
1848. Feb.	9	New Zealand . . . . .	Do.	11	In favour of admission of Jews to Parliament.
"	14	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
"	16	Roman Catholic Relief Bill . . . . .	Do.	8	
Mar.	10	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	16	
"	28	Railway Commissioners . . . . .	Do.	3	
April	3	Navigation Laws . . . . .	Do.		
"	4	Episcopal Revenues . . . . .	Do.		
"	22	Address to the Queen . . . . .	Do.	5	
			St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London		
					Criticizes Government proposals.
					Moves address to the Queen at vestry meeting.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.  
<sup>2</sup> In January, 1846, Mr. Gladstone retired from the representation of Newark and did not re-enter public life until his election for Oxford in August, 1847.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1848. May 16	Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches	House of Commons	3	
" 23	Commercial Policy	Do.	10	Replies to Lord G. Bentinck on free trade.
" 30	Master and Journeymen Bakers	Do.	2	
June 2	Navigation Laws	Do.	22	Favours freedom of navigation.
" 22	Sugar Duties	Do.	17	Opposes reduction of duty.
July 4	Railways	Do.	4	
" 7	Sugar Duties	Do.	10	
" 10	Do.	Do.	4	
" 21	Do.	Do.	1	
" 25	Case of Sir J. T. Claridge	Do.	2	
" 28	Farmers' Estate Society (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	1	
" 31	Sugar Duties	Do.	1	
Aug. 15	Treasury	Do.	—	
" 17	Diplomatic Relations with Rome	Do.	4	Favours legalizing diplomatic relations with the Vatican. On free colonization.
" 18	Vancouver's Island	Do.	20	
1849. Feb. 19	Parliamentary Oaths	Do.	3	
" 22	Clergy Relief Bill	Do.	1	
Mar. 8	Convict Systems	Do.	3	
" 12	Navigation Bill	Do.	23	
" 13	Church Rates	Do.	4	
" 23	Navigation Bill	Do.	7	
" 27	Scientific Colonization	St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London		
April 16	Colonial Administration	House of Commons	9	
May 2	Clergy Relief	Do.	4	
" 16	Disturbances in Canada	Do.	3	Defends right of Parliament to interfere in Colonial matters.

"	24	Colonial Possessions . . . . .	Do.	3	
June	4	Australian Colonies . . . . .	Do.	5	Opposes Bill.
"	14	Canada . . . . .	Do.	36	
"	20	Deceased Wife's Sister . . . . .	Do.	16	
"	26	Colonial Government . . . . .	Do.	11	
July	4	Deceased Wife's Sister . . . . .	Do.	1	Moves for inquiry.
"	5	Hudson's Bay Company . . . . .	Do.	4	
"	12	Merchant Seamen and Pilots . . . . .	Do.	7	
"	12	Van Diemen's Land . . . . .	Do.	2	
1850. Feb.	8	Australian Colonies . . . . .	Do.	4	Favours double-chamber consti- tutions.
"	21	Agricultural Distress . . . . .	Do.	10	In support of Mr. Disraeli's mo- tion.
Mar.	19	Slave Trade . . . . .	Do.	17	
"	22	Australian Colonies . . . . .	Do.	12	
May	1	Benefices in Plurality Bill . . . . .	Do.	1	
"	6	Australian Colonies . . . . .	Do.	14	
"	13	Do. . . . .	Do.	15	
"	31	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	8	
June	27	Greece . . . . .	Do.	47	Don Pacifico debate. Attacks Lord Palmerston's foreign policy. See p. 109.
July	1	Professors of Oxford and Cambridge . . . . .	Do.	1	
"	3	Death of Sir Robert Peel . . . . .	Do.	1	
"	8	Ecclesiastical Commission Bill . . . . .	Do.	2	
"	15	Do. . . . .	Do.	5	
"	18	English and Irish Universities . . . . .	Do.	17	" Last earnest protest" against the Bill.
Aug.	1	Australian Colonies Government Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	Opposes Bill.
1851. Mar.	25	Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill . . . . .	Do.	32	
April	11	Agricultural Distress . . . . .	Do.	7	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1851. April 15	Kaffir War	House of Commons	8	
May 12	Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill	Do.	3	
" 29	Ceylon	Do.	16	
June 30	Inhabited House Duty Bill	Do.	5	Opposes Bill.
July 4	Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill	Do.	6	
" 10	Borneo—Sir James Brooke	Do.	7	Rajah Brooke's methods of suppressing piracy.
" 17	The Horfield Estate	Do.	7	
" 19	Funeral of the Queen Dowager	Do.	3	
1852. Feb. 11	Manchester Education Bill.	Do.	4	
" 20	Colonial Bishops Bill	Do.	—	Introduces Bill.
Mar. 15	Free Trade	Do.	6	
April 5	Kaffir War	Do.	5	Protests against the policy of the war.
" 20	Frome Vicarage	Do.	2	
" 28	Colonial Bishops Bill	Do.	16	
" 30	On Mr. Disraeli's Budget Statement	Do.	3	
May 10	Assignment of Seats, St. Alban's and Sudbury.	Do.	10	
" 11	Maynooth	Do.	8	
" 12	Paper Duty	Do.	6	
" 21	New Zealand Government Bill	Do.	23	
June 8	Frome Vicarage	Do.	23	
" 10	Do.	Do.	1	
" 8	New Zealand Government Bill	Do.	4	
" 17	Do.	Do.	3	
" 18	Frome Vicarage	Do.	8	
" 21	Education.	Do.	4	
" 23	Colonial Church	Do.	12	

Nov. 11	Address . . . . .	Do.	7	Defends Sir Robert Peel's policy. Attacks Government proposals.  Replies to Mr. Disraeli. See p. 155.
" 25	Free Trade . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 26	Do. . . . .	Do.	6	
Dec. 6	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 10	Financial Statement . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 16	Do. . . . .	Do.	28	
" 17	Hop Duties . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 28	Exchequer Loan Fund . . . . .	Do.	2	
Mar. 1	Probate and Legacy Duties . . . . .	Do.	10	
" 3	Import Duties . . . . .	Do.	9	
" 4	Canada Bill (Clergy Reserves) . . . . .	Do.	14	Opposes repeal of duty. See p. 182.
" 10	Attorneys and Solicitors Certificate Duty. . . . .	Do.	6	
" 10	Oaths . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 18	Canada Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 28	Finance . . . . .	Mansion House		
April 4	Education. . . . .	House of Commons	6	
" 5	Foreign and Colonial Wines . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 7	Consolidated Annuities (Ireland) . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 8	National Debt Redemption Acts . . . . .	Do.	28	
" 12	Expenditure of Public Money . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 14	Advertisement Duty . . . . .	Do.	10	
" 18	The Budget . . . . .	Do.	72	
" 22	South Sea Annuities Commutation . . . . .	Do.	10	
" 27	Do. do. . . . .	Do.	3	
May 6	Income Tax (Ireland). . . . .	Do.	4	
" 9	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	11	
" 12	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
" 12	Succession Duties . . . . .	Do.	27	
" 23	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	9	On taxation of Ireland.
" 27	Do. . . . .	Do.	4	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1853. May 30	Customs Act	House of Commons	1	
June 2	Do. (Pictures)	Do.	1	
6	Income Tax	Do.	4	
10	Succession Duties	Do.	4	
13	Savings Banks Bill	Do.		
16	Succession Duty Bill.	Do.		Moves second reading.
20	Do.	Do.	3	
July 1	Advertisement Duty	Do.	3	
4	Succession Duty Bill	Do.	8	Proposes reduction of duty.
12	Malt Duties	Do.	2	
14	Succession Duty Bill.	Do.	8	
18	Do.	Do.	6	
21	Savings Bank Bill	Do.	—	
28	South Sea Annuities.	Do.	4	
29	Do.	Do.	5	
Aug. 3	Colonial Church Regulation Bill.	Do.	21	
13	Land Tax Redemption Act Amendment Bill.	Do.	2	
Sept. 27	Free Trade and Evils of War	Dingwall	1	
27	Do. do.	Inverness		
Oct. 12	Sir Robert Peel	Manchester		
12	Russo-Turkish Question	Do.		
1854. Feb. 2	Revenue and Consolidated Fund Charges	House of Commons	2	
27	Ordinance Estimates	Do.	5	
28	Newspaper Stamps	Do.	3	
Mar. 6	Budget	Do.	47	
8	Issue of Exchequer Bills	Do.	2	
17	Income Tax	Do.	2	
				At unveiling of Sir Robert Peel's statue.

"	17	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	15	Replies to Mr. Disraeli's criticisms.
"	21	Income Tax	.	.	Do.	16	
"	25	War and Finance	.	.	Mansion House		
April	6	Appointment of Mr. Stonor <sup>2</sup>	.	.	House of Commons	5	
"	7	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	15	
"	11	Financial Statement	.	.	Do.	17	
"	27	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	9	
May	1	Do.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	4	Do.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	8	Budget	.	.	Do.	67	
"	11	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	2	
"	22	Exchequer Bonds	.	.	Do.	24	Defends issue of bonds for two millions against Mr. Disraeli's attack.
"	25	Oaths Bill	.	.	Do.	17	
"	26	Income Tax	.	.	Do.	1	
"	29	Exchequer Bonds	.	.	Do.	2	
"	29	Bribery Prevention Bills	.	.	Do.	5	
June	1	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	2	
"	2	Revenue and Consolidated Fund Charges Bill.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	2	Sugar Duties	.	.	Do.	2	
"	12	Stamp Duties	.	.	Do.	5	
"	16	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	4	
"	19	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	20	Case of the Baron de Bode	.	.	Do.	4	On a claim made by Baron de Bode, a British subject, against the French Government in respect of property confiscated by the French Revolutionary tribunals.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

<sup>2</sup> To the office of a judge in the colony of Victoria.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1854. June 21	Church Rates Abolition Bill	House of Commons	8	
" 22	Oxford University Bill	Do.	12	
" 23	Do.	Do.	4	
" 29	Repeal of Usury Laws	Do.	1	Introduces Bill.
July 27	Oxford University Bill	Do.	5	
Aug. 3	Appointment of Mr. Lawley <sup>2</sup>	Do.	6	
" 9	Financial Operations of the Government	Do.	8	
Dec. 13	Queen's Speech—The Navy and the Crimean War.	Do.	6	
" 19	Succession Duties	Do.	3	
" 20	Savings Banks	Do.	5	Motion for regulation of interest.
1855. Jan. 29	Condition of the Army	Do.	28	Opposing Mr. Roebuck's motion.
Feb. 5	Ministerial Explanations	Do.	8	Gives reasons for resignation of the Government.
" 8	Condition of the Army	Do.	2	
" 23	Ministerial Explanations	Do.	25	Explanation as to withdrawal from Cabinet.
" 27	Rt. Hon. T. F. Kennedy <sup>3</sup>	Do.	19	
Mar. 19	The Unfunded Debt	Do.	6	
" 19	Newspaper Stamps	Do.	8	In favour of free press.
" 26	Military Convention with Sardinia	Do.	7	
April 20	Budget	Do.	10	
" 23	Ways and Means	Do.	3	
" 23	Newspaper Stamps	Do.	1	
" 24	Act of Uniformity	Do.	2	
" 26	Customs Duties	Do.	4	
" 30	Loan Bill	Do.	3	
May 9	Marriage Law Amendment	Do.	11	Opposes Bill.
" 21	Vienna Conferences	Do.	2	
				Criticizes Sir G. C. Lewis's Budget.

"	24	Prosecution of the War	.	.	Do.	38
June	8	Do.	.	.	Do.	1
"	15	Terms of Peace	.	.	Do.	1
"	15	Administrative Reform	.	.	Do.	16
July	10	Do.	.	.	Do.	13
"	16	Resignation of Lord John Russell	.	.	Do.	6
"	20	Turkish Loan	.	.	Do.	7
"	23	Do.	.	.	Do.	7
"	27	Do.	.	.	Do.	14
Aug.	2	Exchequer Bills	.	.	Do.	3
"	3	Negotiations at Vienna	.	.	Do.	32
Oct.	12	Colonial Policy	.	.	Do.	
Nov.	12	Do.	.	.	Hawarden	
1856.	Feb. 22	Financial Statement	.	.	Chester	
"	29	Crimean Commissioners' Report.	.	.	House of Commons	4
Mar.	6	Oxford University Bill	.	.	Do.	8
"	14	Persia	.	.	Do.	2
April	1	Salaries of County Court Judges	.	.	Do.	3
"	4	United States	.	.	Do.	2
"	11	National Education	.	.	Do.	3
"	24	Civil Service Reform	.	.	Do.	12
"	24	Public Monies	.	.	Do.	6
May	6	Treaty of Peace	.	.	Do.	2
"	19	Budget	.	.	Do.	17
"	20	Judges and Chancellors	.	.	Do.	6
"	20	Coal Whippers Bill	.	.	Do.	4
June	19	Cambridge University Bill.	.	.	Do.	3
"	20		.	.	Do.	1

Favours open admission to the Civil Service.

Attacks the method by which the Turkish Loan is guaranteed.

Condemns Government proposals, On competitive examinations.

Criticism.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.  
<sup>2</sup> To the Governorship of South Australia.

<sup>3</sup> *re* Mr. Kennedy's removal from the office of Woods, Forests and Land Revenues of the Crown.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1856. July 1	United States . . . . .	House of Commons	29	Army recruiting and the United States Government.
" 4	Salary of Bishop of New Zealand . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 10	Appellate Jurisdiction Bill . . . . .	Do.	11	Criticism of Bill.
" 11	County Court Acts Amendment Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	As to appointment of a Vice-President of Committee of Council.
" 22	Education. . . . .	Do.	3	Vigorously opposes Bill.
" 23	Bishops of London and Durham Retirement Bill.	Do.	12	
" 24	Do. do.	Do.	7	
" 26	Bishops (Scotland) . . . . .	Do.	4	
Sept. 29	Foreign Missionary Society . . . . .	Mold		
" 29	Society for Propagation of the Gospel . . . . .	Liverpool		
" Jan. 31	Duty of the Rich to the Poor . . . . .	Stepney		
1857. Feb. 3	Queen's Speech . . . . .	House of Commons	20	Criticizes Government's foreign policy and financial measures.
" 5	Hudson's Bay Company . . . . .	Do.	7	Supports motion to appoint a Committee.
" 13	Financial Statement . . . . .	Do.	2	Condemnation of Sir G. C. Lewis's Budget.
" 20	Budget . . . . .	Do.	34	
" 23	Do. . . . .	Do.	1	Supports Mr. Cobden.
Mar. 3	China . . . . .	Do.	21	
" 5	Financial Plans. . . . .	Do.	7	Proposes reduction of tea duty and criticizes Sir G. C. Lewis's Budget.
" 6	Ways and Means . . . . .	Do.	17	
" 9	Income Tax Bill . . . . .	Do.	6	

"	10	Navy Estimates	.	.	.	Do.	17	Favours reduction of expenditure.
June	2	Diocesan Spiritual Help Society.	.	.	.	Oxford		
July	9	Christian and Classical Education	.	.	.	Glenalmond College		
"	16	Persian War	.	.	.	House of Commons	9	War in China denounced.
"	17	Persian War and Chinese War	.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	21	Oaths Validity Act Amendment Bill	.	.	.	Do.	9	Explains objections.
"	24	Divorce Bill	.	.	.	Do.	12	
"	29	Superannuation Act	.	.	.	Do.	12	
"	31	Divorce Bill	.	.	.	Do.	13	
Aug.	4	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	1	Criticizes and moves amendments.
"	4	Burial Acts Amendment Bill	.	.	.	Do.	4	Protests against unequal treatment of men and women.
"	7	Divorce Bill	.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	12	Tea and Sugar Duties	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	13	Divorce Bill	.	.	.	Do.	10	Balkan Principalities.
"	14	Euphrates Valley Railway.	.	.	.	Do.	8	Lincoln divorce case.
"	14	Personal Explanation	.	.	.	Do.	2	Speech on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.
Oct.	12	India, England's duty to	.	.	.	Chester		Urging closer connexion between the great manufacturing towns and the Universities.
"	22	Education.	.	.	.	Liverpool		
Dec.	4	Bank Issues Indemnity Bill	.	.	.	House of Commons	9	Protests against proposed increase of pension.
"	7	do.	.	.	.	Do.	2	Appointment of select committee.
"	9	Pension to Sir Henry Havelock	.	.	.	Do.	1	Opposes Bill.
"	11	Bank Act	.	.	.	Do.	11	
1858. Feb.	19	Conspiracy to Murder Bill	.	.	.	Do.	14	
Mar.	12	Capture of the <i>Cagliari</i> <sup>2</sup>	.	.	.	Do.	2	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

<sup>2</sup> The *Cagliari* was a mail boat belonging to a steamboat company in Genoa. It was captured on the High Seas by Neapolitan cruisers, and the crew, amongst whom were two Englishmen, were imprisoned.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1853. Mar. 22	Oaths Bill	House of Commons	2	
April 19	Budget . . . . .	Do.	4	On Mr. Disraeli's Budget statement. Criticism.
" 21	Church Rates Abolition Bill	Do.	3	
" 26	Government of India Bill . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 30	Do. . . . .	Do.	5	
May 3	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
" 3	Exchequer Bonds . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 4	Danubian Principalities . . . . .	Do.	22	
" 21	Oude—Lord Ellenborough's Despatch.	Do.	4	
June 1	Suez Canal . . . . .	Do.	2	Defence of Lord Canning.
" 1	Case of Mr. Washington Wilks <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	Do.	8	Opposes English interference.
" 7	India Government Committee . . . . .	Do.	18	
" 8	Church Rates Abolition . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 14	India Government Committee . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 20	Hudson's Bay Company . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 28	Funded Debt Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
July 1	Government of India . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 1	Universities (Scotland) Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	Favours the creation of a national university.
" 6	Government of India Bill . . . . .	Do.	5	Motion that the army of India shall not be employed beyond its frontiers.
" 19	Metropolis Local Management Act Amendment Bill.	Do.	6	
" 19	New Caledonia . . . . .	Do.	2	
Oct. 17	University Extension. . . . .	Liverpool		
Dec. 2	Ionian Islands <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	Corfu		
" 15	Do. . . . .	Zante		Speech in Italian.

1859.	Jan. 25	Do.	.	.	.	Corfu			Address to the Assembly. Speech in Italian to the Assembly.
	Feb. 4	Do.	.	.	.	Do.			
	Mar. 10	Exchequer Bills	.	.	.	House of Commons		4	
	" 18	Superannuation Bill	.	.	.	Do.		4	
	" 29	Representation of the People	.	.	.	Do.		23	
	April 8	Galway Mail Contract	.	.	.	Do.		2	
	" 18	State of Europe—Italian Question	.	.	.	Do.		4	
	June 22	Royal Literary Fund	.	.	.	London			Presides at dinner.
	July 6	Endowed Schools Bill	.	.	.	House of Commons		2	
	" 7	Packet Contracts	.	.	.	Do.		7	
	" 12	Roman Catholic Relief Act Amendment	.	.	.	Do.		5	In favour of Roman Catholics being allowed to hold the offices of Chancellor of Ireland.
	" 18	Budget	.	.	.	Do.		25	Introduces Budget.
	" 21	Financial Policy of late Government	.	.	.	Do.		11	
	" 21	Ways and Means	.	.	.	Do.		5	Replies to criticisms of Mr. Disraeli.
	" 28	Prussia—Neutrality	.	.	.	Do.		5	
	" 29	Income Tax	.	.	.	Do.		2	
	Aug. 4	Estimates	.	.	.	Do.		4	
	" 4	Election Compromises—Bodmin	.	.	.	Do.		2	
	" 6	Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill	.	.	.	Do.		2	" His eloquence . . . which burst forth to-night with unusual brilliance " (Mr. Disraeli). " My best offhand speech " (Mr. Gladstone).
	" 8	Italy	.	.	.	Do.		18	
	" 11	Chiltern Hundreds	.	.	.	Do.		1	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.  
<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wilks, the proprietor and publisher of a provincial newspaper, had been placed in the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms for committing a breach of privilege by publishing a defamatory article concerning a member of the House.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Gladstone left England as Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands on November 8, 1858, and returned on March 8, 1859. During his stay many speeches were delivered and duly reported in the Greek newspapers, copies of which are preserved in the Monument Room at Hawarden. The four speeches given above received prominent attention in the English press.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1859 Nov. 1	Oxford and Cambridge Mission to Central Africa.			
1860. Jan. 25	Address . . . . .	House of Commons	7	On a good understanding with France.
" 26	Savings Banks . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 30	Telegraphic Contracts . . . . .	Do.	3	
Feb. 2	Civil Service . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 10	Financial Statement . . . . .	Do.	61	
" 20	Customs Acts Committee . . . . .	Do.	15	Introduces Budget. See p. 253.
" 24	Commercial Treaty with France. . . . .	Do.	20	Defends Commercial Treaty.
" 27	Duties on Foreign Wines . . . . .	Do.	18	Replies to criticisms.
				Defends proposed reduction of duty.
Mar. 1	Customs Act . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 2	Do. . . . .	Do.	6	
" 5	Savings Banks and Friendly Societies. . . . .	Do.	2	Explains objects of Bill.
" 5	Commercial Treaty with France. . . . .	Do.	8	Savoy and Nice.
" 9	Customs Act . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 9	Commercial Treaty with France. . . . .	Do.	17	Defence of Treaty.
" 12	Paper Duty Repeal . . . . .	Do.	13	
" 14	Religious Worship Bill . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 15	Customs Act . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 23	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	9	
" 26	Do. . . . .	Do.	12	
" 26	Wine Licences Bill . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 27	Telegraphic Contracts . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 30	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	8	
" April 2	Customs Act . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 16	Work of Universities. . . . .	Glasgow		Inaugural address to the University of Glasgow.

20	Paper Duty Repeal . . .	.	.	House of Commons	2
"	Representation of the People	.	.	Do.	24
May 3	Fire Insurance . . .	.	.	Do.	7
" 4	Wine Licences Bill . . .	.	.	Do.	9
" 7	Factory Boy Appointments	.	.	Do.	3
" 8	Paper Duty Repeal . . .	.	.	Do.	9
" 1	Do.	.	.	Do.	2
June 1	Civil Service Examinations	.	.	Do.	6
" 5	Income Tax . . .	.	.	Do.	4
" 14	Savings Banks . . .	.	.	Do.	8
" 22	Tax Bills . . .	.	.	Do.	11
July 5		.	.		
Protests against interference by House of Lords with Supply Bills.					
" 12	Operations in China . . .	.	.	Do.	6
" 13	Do.	.	.	Do.	2
" 16	Do.	.	.	Do.	2
" 16	Financial Statement . . .	.	.	Do.	17
" 17	Education Bill . . .	.	.	Do.	1
" 17	Paper Duty Repeal . . .	.	.	Do.	4
" 20	Savings Banks . . .	.	.	Do.	3
" Aug. 6	Paper Duty Repeal . . .	.	.	Do.	25
" 7	Malt Duty . . .	.	.	Do.	3
" Nov. 8	Volunteer Movement	.	.	Chester	
" 1861. Feb. 7	Bank of England Committee	.	.	House of Commons	3
" 8	Fire Insurance . . .	.	.	Do.	3
" 8	Post Office Savings Banks	.	.	Do.	—
" 19	Income and Property Tax	.	.	Do.	12
" 19	Probate Duty . . .	.	.	Do.	5
" 21	Bank of England Committee	.	.	Do.	2
" 22	Postal Subsidies . . .	.	.	Do.	3
" 27	Church Rates Abolition . . .	.	.	Do.	10
Explains provisions of Bill. Opposes income tax inquiry. Introduces Bill. Opposes Bill.					
Defends reduction of duty.					

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1861. Mar. 4	Exchequer Bills	House of Commons	12	
" 5	Hop Duties	Do.	8	
" 7	Italy	Do.	14	Defence of Government policy.
" 8	Fire Insurance	Do.	7	
" 14	The China War	Do.	4	On war expenditure.
" 15	Wine Duty	Do.	9	
" 18	Post Office Savings Banks	Do.	3	
" 19	East India Income Tax	Do.	4	
" 22	Tea and Sugar Duties	Do.	4	
April 8	Post Office Savings Banks.	Do.	4	
" 15	Budget	Do.	51	Introduces Budget.
" 29	Ways and Means	Do.	25	Replies to criticisms.
May 2	Do.	Do.	23	Moves continuance of tea and sugar duties.
" 6	Estimates	Do.		Effect of war with China on financial proposals.
" 7	Ionian Islands	Do.	20	Defend his acts as Lord High Commissioner.
" 9	Ways and Means	Do.	3	
" 16	Customs and Inland Revenue	Do.	16	
" 27	Do.	Do.	4	
" 30	Do.	Do.	18	
June 14	Galway Postal Contracts	Do.	5	
" 21	Civil Service Examinations.	Do.	4	
July 5	Wakefield Writ	Do.	1	
" 12	The Danish Claims	Do.	3	
" 12	University Elections Bill	Do.	5	Opposes third reading.
" 19	Cession of Sardinia	Do.	7	On misgovernment of Italy.
" 25	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	2	

29	Appropriation Bill	.	.	.	3	
Oct. 10	The Pursuit of Science	.	.	.		Do.
Nov. 27	Christian Aspect of Education	.	.	.		Liverpool London (Willis's Rooms) Edinburgh
1862. Jan. 11	American Civil War and French Treaty	.	.	.		House of Commons
Feb. 10	Income Tax	.	.	.	5	Do.
" 11	Exchequer Bills	.	.	.	2	Do.
Mar. 11	Public Monies	.	.	.	2	Do.
" 18	Education.	.	.	.	10	Do.
April 1	Fire Insurance	.	.	.	7	Do.
" 3	Budget	.	.	.	45	Do.
" 7	Ways and Means	.	.	.	12	Do.
" 10	Brewers' Licences	.	.	.	5	Do.
" 11	State of Italy	.	.	.	17	Do.
" 23	Competitive Examinations Death of Prince Consort	.	.	.		Manchester
" 24	Finance	.	.	.		Do.
" 29	Public Buildings	.	.	.	4	House of Commons
May 8	Customs and Inland Revenue	.	.	.	17	Do.
" 13	Income Tax	.	.	.	12	Do.
" 16	Civil Service Charges.	.	.	.	—	Do.
June 13	Allege Outrage on Mr. Taylor <sup>2</sup>	.	.	.	5	Do.
" 16	Middle Class Education	.	.	.		London
" 17	Income Tax	.	.	.	4	House of Commons
July 4	Malt Duty	.	.	.	2	Do.
" 9	Kertch and Yenikale Prize Money	.	.	.	1	Do.

Science and Art estimate.  
Introduces Budget.  
Replies to criticisms.  
Defends policy of Government.

Condemns extravagance in public expenditure.

Replies to criticisms of Sir Stafford Northcote.

Defends principles on which the tax is levied.

Address at Archbishop Tenison's Grammar School.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. George Græme Watson Taylor, a British subject, had been, so it was alleged, unfairly treated by the Italian Government.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1862. July 22	Post Office	House of Commons	4	Unveiling of statue.
" 26	Sir Hugh Myddelton	London		
Sept. 24	Agriculture	Mold		
Oct. 7	American Civil War } French Treaty	Newcastle-on-Tyne		
" 9	Foreign Affairs	Sunderland		
" 9	Commercial and Social Progress.	Middlesbrough		
" 10	America and Italy	York		
" 22	Railways	Wrexham		
Dec. 27	Lancashire Distress	Chester		
Jan. 5	Sicily	Hawarden		
Feb. 13	Inclosure of Crown Lands	House of Commons	1	Explains provisions of Bill.
" 13	Post Office Savings Bank	Do.	5	On the provision of an establishment.
" 13	Tobacco Duties	Do.	4	Do.
" 19	Prince of Wales	Do.	2	do.
" 23	Do.	Do.	1	
" 27	Tobacco Duties.	Do.	6	
Mar. 4	Qualification for Office Abolition Bill	Do.	3	Supports Bill.
" 19	Tobacco Duties	Do.	5	
" 24	Income Tax	Do.	11	
" 24	Appropriation	Do.	3	
" 26	Diplomatic Service	Do.	2	
April 15	Burials Bill	Do.	4	Supports Bill.
" 16	Budget	Do.	60	Introduces Budget.
" 23	Income Tax	Do.	7	
" 30	Stock Certificates to Bearer	Do.	7	
" 30	Customs and Inland Revenue	Do.	8	
May 4	Do.	Do.	30	Income tax on charity trust funds. See b. 312.

"	8	Commerce with Naples	.	.	Do.	8	Defends Italian policy of Government.
"	11	Inland Revenue	.	.	Do.	5	
"	12	Ionian Islands	.	.	Do.	5	
"	28	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	Do.	9	
"	28	Ways and Means	.	.	Do.	1	Cheap train services.
"	29	Turkey and Her Dependencies	.	.	Do.	8	
June	9	Uniformity Act	.	.	Do.	11	
"	12	Ireland	.	.	Do.	10	
"	15	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	Do.	10	
"	30	Recognition of the Southern Confederacy.	.	.	Do.	12	Opposes recognition.
July	2	Exhibition Buildings	.	.	Do.	17	
"	14	Fire Insurance	.	.	Do.	5	
"	14	Union Relief Aid Acts Continuance Bill	.	.	Do.	4	
"	17	Civil Service Competitions	.	.	Do.	4	
"	20	Poland	.	.	Do.	12	On the condition of Poland.
"	24	Subscription to Formularies of Faith	.	.	Do.	10	Petition for abolition of tests at Oxford.
Oct.	26	Wedgwood	.	.	Burslem		
1864.	Jan.	Thrift	.	.	Buckley		
Feb.	4	The Address	.	.	House of Commons	5	Schleswig-Holstein question.
"	8	Collection of Taxes Bill	.	.	Do.	6	
"	11	Bank Acts (Scotland)	.	.	Do.	4	Introduces Bill.
"	15	Malt for Cattle Bill	.	.	Do.	7	
"	22	Denmark and Germany	.	.	Do.	2	
"	25	Malt for Cattle Bill	.	.	Do.	6	
"	26	Taxation of Ireland	.	.	Do.	4	
"	7	Government Annuities Bill	.	.	Do.	38	Defends Bill.
Mar.	10	The Scheldt Toll	.	.	Do.	3	
"	16	Abolition of Tests (Oxford)	.	.	Do.	10	Supports Bill.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1864. Mar. 17	Mr. Stansfeld and the Greco Conspiracy	House of Commons	4	On cession of the islands to Greece.
" 18	Ionian Islands . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 18	Government Annuities Bill	Do.	5	
April 5	Public Lands and Buildings	Do.	3	
" 7	The Budget . . . . .	Do.	57	
" 11	Government Annuities Bill	Do.	6	
" 14	Sugar and Malt Duties . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 21	Ways and Means . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 21	Departure of Garibaldi . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 27	Bank Notes (Scotland) Bill	Do.	5	
May 2	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	4	On direct and indirect taxation. On the extension of the franchise in towns.
" 6	Public Schools Commission	Do.	10	
" 10	Select Commission on Taxation . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 11	Borough Franchise Bill . . . . .	Do.	13	
" 30	Spirit Duties . . . . .	Do.	8	
June 3	Masters in the Navy . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 9	Collection of Taxes Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 14	Income Tax . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 20	Collection of Taxes Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 20	Government Annuities Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 22	Bank Notes (Scotland) Bill . . . . .	Do.	3	Replies to Mr. Disraeli's vote of censure (Schleswig-Holstein).
" 23	National Education (Ireland) . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 23	Weighing of Grain (Port of London) Bill	Do.	2	
" 24	Duty on Malt . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 27	Annuity to King of Greece . . . . .	Do.	3	
July 4	Denmark and Germany . . . . .	Do.	26	
" 14	New Zealand Loan Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	

"	15	Ionian Islands . . . . .	Do.	1	
"	19	Paper Manufacture . . . . .	Do.	9	
"	21	Appropriation Bill . . . . .	Do.	1	
Oct.	11	Social Progress . . . . .	Bolton		
"	12	Factory System and Open Spaces	Do.		
"	12	Colonial and Foreign Policy . . . . .	Liverpool		
"	14	Finance . . . . .	Manchester		
"	14	Christian Civilization . . . . .	Oxford		
Nov.	8	Law and Lawyers . . . . .	London		
"	10	Volunteer Movement . . . . .	Do.		
Dec.	30	Coal Resources of the Country . . . . .	Mold		
1865. Feb.	10	Banks of Issue Bill . . . . .	House of Commons	4	
"	14	Railways . . . . .	Do.	—	
"	20	Bank of Ireland Bill . . . . .	Do.	2	
"	23	Bank Notes Issue Bill . . . . .	Do.	5	
"	24	Ireland . . . . .	Do.	10	
Mar.	9	Pensions of Officers of House of Lords	Do.	1	
"	10	Medical Officers in Unions (Ireland) . . . . .	Do.	2	
"	28	Church Establishment (Ireland) . . . . .	Do.	15	
April	7	Irish Railway System . . . . .	Do.	6	
"	27	Budget . . . . .	Do.	44	
"	28	Out-door Officers of Customs . . . . .	Do.	5	
May	1	Bank Notes Issue Bill . . . . .	Do.	7	
"	4	Ways and Means . . . . .	Do.	6	
"	5	Science and Art Collections . . . . .	Do.	4	
"	19	Attorneys', etc., Certificate Duty	Do.	5	
"	22	Union Chargeability Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
"	25	Bank Notes Issue Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
"	31	Parliamentary Reform . . . . .	Chester	4	

Appeals against extravagance in national expenditure.

Banquet to M. Berryer.

Announces appointment of a Government commission.

On the state of Ireland.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1865. June 9	Civil Service Estimates . . .	House of Commons	4	
" 14	Abolition of Tests (Oxford) . .	Do.	6	Opposes Mr. Goschen's Bill.
" 15	Malt Duty . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 15	Sugar Duties . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 15	Controller of the Exchequer Bill	Do.	3	
" 20	University Education (Ireland) Bill	Do.	9	
" 22	Appropriation Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
July 18	Political Situation . . . . .	Manchester		
" 18	Finance . . . . .	Liverpool		
Oct. 18	Duke of Newcastle, Tribute to .	Shire Oaks, Notts		Defeated at Oxford University.
Nov. 1	Parliamentary Reform . . . . .	Glasgow		Replies to Mr. Disraeli's attacks.
" 1	Commerce and War . . . . .	Do.		
" 1	Free Trade, Cheap Press and Social Legislation.	Do.		On presentation of the freedom of Glasgow.
" 3	"The Place of Ancient Greece in the providential order of the World."	Edinburgh		Address to Edinburgh University.
1866. Feb. 1	Election of Speaker . . . . .	House of Commons	2	
" 8	Address . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 12	Cattle Diseases Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 15	Do. . . . .	Do.	2	
" 16	Do. . . . .	Do.	3	
" 17	Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	8	Defence of Bill.
" 22	Princess Helena and Prince Alfred	Do.	4	Public grant.
" 22	Monument to Lord Palmerston . .	Do.	6	A tribute to the memory of Lord Palmerston.
" 23	Fenianism in America . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 26	Public Expenditure . . . . .	Do.	4	Plea for economy.

Suggests a compromise for settling the question.

Explains provisions of Representation of the People Bill.

Replies to Mr. Lowe's criticisms.

See p. 342.

Introduces Bill.  
Do.

Explains provisions of Bill.

28	Prince Alfred's Annuity Bill	.	.	Do.	2
"	Devonport Election	.	.	Do.	1
"	State of Roumania	.	.	Do.	1
"	Church Rates Abolition Bill	.	.	Do.	8
"	Navy Estimates	.	.	Do.	4
"	Parliamentary Reform	.	.	Do.	21
"	Electoral Statistics	.	.	Do.	2
"	Day of Humiliation	.	.	Do.	2
"	Electoral Statistics	.	.	Do.	3
April	Reform Bill	.	.	Liverpool	
"	Do.	.	.	Do.	
"	Crown Lands Acts	.	.	House of Commons	4
"	New Houses of Parliament	.	.	Do.	3
"	Parliamentary Reform	.	.	Do.	26
"	Malt Duty	.	.	Do.	9
"	Bank Notes (Ireland) Bill	.	.	Do.	6
"	Rates on Government Property	.	.	Do.	3
"	Poor Law Expenditure	.	.	Do.	3
"	Representation of the People Bill	.	.	Do.	39
"	Ministerial Statement	.	.	Do.	3
May	Budget	.	.	Do.	44
"	Redistribution of Seats Bill	.	.	Do.	22
"	Compulsory Church Rate Abolition Bill	.	.	Do.	6
"	Crown Lands Bill	.	.	Do.	3
"	The Monetary Crisis	.	.	Do.	3
"	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	.	.	Do.	2
"	Terminable Annuities Bill	.	.	Do.	25
"	Representation of the People Bill	.	.	Do.	2
"	Elective Franchise Bill	.	.	Do.	11

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1866. June 4	Redistribution of Seats Bill	House of Commons	29	
" 7	Princess Mary of Cambridge	Do.	3	
" 7	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	22	
" 11	State of Europe	Do.	8	Austro-Prussian question.
" 11	Redistribution of Seats Bill	Do.	7	
" 12	Coal Commission	Do.	3	
" 14	Redistribution of Seats Bill	Do.	3	
" 15	Mr. Hume	Do.	3	Pays tribute to memory of Mr. Hume.
" 15	Sugar Duties	Do.	4	
" 18	Redistribution of Seats Bill	Do.	19	
" 26	Resignation of the Ministry	Do.	9	Announces resignation of Lord Russell's Government.
" 28	Do.	Do.	2	
July 5	Do.	Do.	1	
" 16	The Queen's University	Do.	12	
" 18	Compulsory Church Rate Abolition Bill	Do.	2	Moves second reading.
" 20	Foreign Policy	Do.	12	European affairs and Lord Palmerston's Italian policy.
" 20	Railways (Ireland) Bill	Do.	2	Inaugural meeting of Cobden Club.
" 21	Mr. Cobden	London		
" 23	Supply	House of Commons	7	
" 25	Tenure of Land (Ireland) Bill	Do.	3	
" 27	Railways (Ireland) Bill	Do.	2	
" 30	Fortifications Bill	Do.	3	
" 31	Currency and Banking	Do.	5	
" Aug. 1	Compulsory Church Rate Abolition Bill	Do.	4	
" 2	Habeas Corpus Suspension Act (Ireland)	Do.	7	Supports renewal of Act.



## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1867. April 2	Railway Companies Debenture Debt .	House of Commons	2	
" 4	Financial Statement . . . . .	Do.	13	
" 9	Offices and Oaths Bill . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 10	Tests Abolition (Oxford) . . . . .	Do.	1	
" 11	Representation of the People Bill .	Do.	16	
" 12	do. . . . .	Do.	9	
May 3	Proposed Reform Meeting in Hyde Park	Do.	5	
" 6	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	6	
" 7	Established Church. (Ireland) . . . .	Do.	9	
" 9	Representation of the People Bill . .	Do.	17	
" 12	Reform . . . . .	Manchester		
" 13	Representation of the People Bill	House of Commons	5	
	(Scotland)			
" 14	Malt Tax . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 16	National Debt Acts Bill . . . . .	Do.	12	
" 17	Representation of the People Bill . .	Do.	8	
" 27	do. . . . .	Do.	2	
" 28	do. . . . .	Do.	8	
" 29	Uniformity Act Amendment Bill	Do.	5	
" 30	Representation of the People Bill . .	Do.	7	
" 31	do. . . . .	Do.	5	
" 31	Queen's University . . . . .	Do.	7	
June 5	Oxford and Cambridge Education Bill	Do.	4	
" 17	Representation of the People Bill . .	Do.	6	
" 18	do. . . . .	Do.	2	
" 18	Trinity College, Dublin . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 24	Representation of the People Bill . .	Do.	5	
" 25	do. . . . .	Do.	5	
	do. . . . .	Do.	2	
				On corrupt practices at elections.
				Criticizes Mr. Disraeli's statement.
				On the right of public meeting in parks and open spaces.

28	do.	.	Do.	2
" 28	Representation of Ireland	.	Do.	4
July 2	Representation of the People Bill	.	Do.	4
" 4	do.	.	Do.	2
" 8	do.	.	Do.	7
" 10	Education of the Poor Bill	.	Do.	4
" 18	Civil Service Estimates	.	Do.	2
" 29	Parks Regulation Bill	.	Do.	3
Aug. 1	Irish Railways	.	Do.	4
" 8	Lords Amendments to Representation of the People Bill.	.	Do.	15
Nov. 19	The Address	.	Do.	7
" 22	Fenian Convicts at Manchester	.	Do.	2
" 26	Abyssinian Expedition	.	Do.	8
" 28	Do.	.	Do.	11
" 29	Parliamentary Boroughs	.	Do.	1
Dec. 18	National Prosperity } Ireland	.	Oldham	
" 18	Education.	.	Werneth	
" 18	Education, Machinery and Foreign Competition.	.	Oldham	
" 19	Reform Bill	.	Ormskirk	
" 19	Fenianism and the Condition of Ireland	.	Southport	
Feb. 3	Sir Walter Scott	.	Hawarden	
" 13	Corrupt Practices Bill	.	House of Commons	3
" 14	Public Schools Bill	.	Do.	3
" 18	Labour Questions	.	London	
" 19	Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill	.	House of Commons	8
" 28	Reconstruction of Ministry	.	Do.	1
Mar. 6	Alabama Claims	.	Do.	4
To deputation from London Trades Unions.				

On financial proposals to meet expenses of Abyssian War.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard.	Remarks.
1868. Mar. 6	Representation of People (Ireland) Bill	House of Commons	2	
" 11	Church Rates Regulation Bill	Do.	3	
" 16	State of Ireland	Do.	30	Declares for Irish Church dis- establishment.
" 18	Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill.	Do.	2	
" 19	Compounding for Rates	Do.	2	
" 23	Irish Church	Do.	—	Gives notice of three resolutions on Irish Church establishment.
" 24	Licences	Do.	2	
Mar. 28	Irish Church	London		At banquet to Mr. Brand.
" 30	Established Church (Ireland)	House of Commons	24	
April 3	Do.	Do.	17	Replies to Mr. Disraeli.
" 23	Financial Statement	Do.	6	
" 24	Permanent Expenses of Commissions.	Do.	3	
" 27	Duke of Edinburgh	Do.	1	
" 30	Established Church (Ireland)	Do.	18	Answers criticisms on first resolu- tion.
May 4	Ministerial Statement	Do.	12	Protests against proposed dissolu- tion of Parliament.
" 4	Ways and Means	Do.	6	
" 5	Ministerial Statement	Do.	6	
" 7	Established Church (Ireland)	Do.	17	
" 14	Boundary Bill	Do.	7	
" 14	Established Church (Ireland)	Do.	3	
" 18	Representation of People (Scotland) Bill	Do.	3	
" 22	Established Church (Ireland)	Do.	21	Moves second and third resolutions.
" 28	Representation of People (Scotland) Bill	Do.	4	
" 29	Dissolution of Parliament	Do.	4	
" 29	Rules of the House	Do.	1	

June	4	East Worcestershire Election	.	Do.	6
"	5	Established Church (Ireland)	.	Do.	3
"	8	Boundary Bill	.	Do.	3
"	8	Representation of People (Scotland Bill)	.	Do.	1
"	9	Electric Telegraphs Bill	.	Do.	3
"	11	Registration Bill	.	Do.	2
"	12	Established Church (Ireland)	.	Do.	1
"	18	Representation of People (Ireland) Bill	.	Do.	5
"	22	Do.	.	Do.	1
"	25	Mr. Disraeli's speech at Merchant Taylors' Hall.	.	Do.	4
"	25	Corrupt Practices Bill	.	Do.	2
"	30	Revenue Officers' Disabilities Removal Bill.	.	Do.	5
July	2	Abyssinian Expedition	.	Do.	3
"	3	Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill	.	Do.	6
"	4	Capital and Labour	.	London	
"	6	Corrupt Practices Bill	.	House of Commons	2
"	9	Princess of Wales	.	Do.	—
"	16	Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill	.	Do.	4
"	18	Corrupt Practices Bill	.	Do.	1
"	20	Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill	.	Do.	2
"	21	Electric Telegraphs Bill	.	Do.	5
"	22	England's duty to Ireland.	.	Romsey	
"	24	Foreign Cattle Trade.	.	House of Commons	2
"	27	The late Lord Brougham	.	Do.	2
Aug.	5	Irish Church Disestablishment	.	St. Helens	

Seconds vote of thanks to the Army.

At meeting of Social Science Association.

Tribute to the memory of Lord Brougham.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1868. Oct. 12	Irish Church Disestablishment Public Expenditure	Warrington		
" 14	Irish Church Disestablishment Reform Bill	Liverpool		
" 16	Conservative Party	Do.		
" 17	Irish Church Disestablishment	Newton		
" 20	Do.	Leigh		
" 21	Public Expenditure	Ormskirk		
" 21	Irish Church Disestablishment Do.	Southport		
" 23	Public Expenditure	Wigan		
Nov. 13	Irish Church Disestablishment	Bootle		
" 14	Ritualism	Garston		
" 14	Conservative Party	Wavertree		
" 16	Irish Church Disestablishment	Widnes		
" 16	Public Expenditure	St. Helens		
" 18	Irish Church Disestablishment Do.	Preston		
1869. Feb. 11	Liberal Programme	London	12	
" 16	The Address	House of Commons	2	
" 18	Report on Address	Do.	1	
" 22	Do.	Do.	4	
" 22	Pensions for Civil Officers	Do.	4	
" 23	Local Taxation	Do.	1	
" 23	Vacating of Seats Bill	Do.	53	
Mar. 1	Established Church (Ireland) Bill	Do.		Introduces bill to disestablish the Irish Church.
" 4	Parliamentary and Municipal Elections.	Do.	2	
" 5	Appointment of Sir E. Wetherall	Do.	3	

Replies to personal calumnies.

At Fishmongers' Hall.

"	9	Real Estate Intestacy Bill.	.	Do.	2
"	9	Representative Peers Bill.	.	Do.	1
"	16	Parliamentary and Municipal Elections	.	Do.	4
"	17	Revenue Officers Bill	.	Do.	6
"	22	British Payments to Greece	.	Do.	1
"	23	Established Church (Ireland)	.	Do.	23
April	2	Civil Service Appointments	.	Do.	1
"	2	Navy Estimates	.	Do.	2
"	6	House of Commons Arrangements	.	Do.	3
"	6	Ireland—Postage	.	Do.	2
"	8	Ways and Means	.	Do.	3
"	9	Civil and Diplomatic Appointments	.	Do.	3
"	9	Civil Service Estimates	.	Do.	6
"	13	Lord Lieutenants (Cumberland and Westmoreland).	.	Do.	4
"	15	Established Church (Ireland)	.	Do.	10
"	16	Do.	.	Do.	8
"	20	Do.	.	Do.	1
"	22	Do.	.	Do.	2
"	23	Do.	.	Do.	3
"	26	Do.	.	Do.	4
"	29	Do.	.	Do.	7
"	30	State of Ireland	.	Do.	8
May	4	Irish Church Bill	.	Do.	3
"	5	O'Sullivan's Disability Bill	.	Do.	5
"	6	Irish Church Bill	.	Do.	20
"	11	O'Sullivan's Disability Bill	.	Do.	2
"	11	Witnesses (House of Commons)	.	Do.	2
"	13	Irish Church Bill	.	Do.	3
"	27	Civil Officers' Pensions	.	Do.	5

Closes debate on second reading.  
[See p. 380.]

Replies to criticisms.

Future status of Irish clergy.

Daniel O'Sullivan, Mayor of Cork.  
A bill to remove him from office.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1869. May 28	'Lavelle v. Proudfoot' . . .	House of Commons	3	Third reading.
" 31	Irish Church Bill . . .	Do.	19	
June 1	British Columbia . . .	Do.	3	
" 4	Revision of the Statute Law . . .	Do.	3	
" 7	Representation of the People Act Amendment Bill.	Do.	1	
" 18	Bankruptcy Bill . . .	Do.	3	
" 21	Assessed Rates Bills . . .	Do.	3	
" 22	New Law Courts . . .	Do.	3	
" 24	Civil Officers (Pension) Bill . . .	Do.	3	
" 28	Audit of Public Accounts . . .	Do.	2	
" 29	University Tests Bill . . .	Do.	2	
July 1	Regina v. Overend Gurney & Co. . .	Do.	6	Defends change of opinion.
" 8	Canada Railway Loan . . .	Do.	3	
" 8	Recent Negotiations with U.S.A. . .	Do.	2	
" 8	Supply . . .	Do.	2	
" 9	Central Asia . . .	Do.	2	
" 15	Irish Church Bill—Lords Amendments	Do.	22	Moves rejection of Lords amendments.
" 16	Do.	Do.	5	Supports Mr. Chambers' Bill.
" 20	Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill	Do.	1	Motion agreeing to Lords final amendments.
" 23	Irish Church Bill—Lords Amendments	Do.	9	
Aug. 5	Bishops' Resignation Bill . . .	Do.	5	
" 5	Canada Loan Bill . . .	Do.	2	
Nov. 9	Public Affairs . . .	London		
1870. Feb. 8	The Address . . .	House of Commons	13	Lord Mayor's banquet.
" 10	Tipperary Election . . .	Do.	4	On the condition of Ireland.
" 14	Epping Forest . . .	Do.	3	

"	15	Irish Land Bill	.	.	.	Do.	55	Introduces Bill.
"	21	Local Taxation	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	22	Revenue Officers	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	25	Competitive Examinations	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	28	Treaties of Commerce	.	.	.	Do.	1	On state-aided emigration to
Mar.	1	Emigration	.	.	.	Do.	12	British colonies.
"	4	Malt Tax	.	.	.	Do.	2	Second reading.
"	11	Irish Land Bill	.	.	.	Do.	26	
"	17	Political Prisoners (Ireland)	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	17	Naval Retirement	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	17	Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	18	Elementary Education Bill	.	.	.	Do.	10	
"	22	Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	18	
"	25	Do.	.	do.	.	Do.	3	
"	28	Irish Land Bill	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	31	Suffragan Bishops	.	.	.	Do.	2	
April	1	Trinity College, Dublin	.	.	.	Do.	14	
"	1	Irish Land Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	Opposes an amendment of Mr.
"	4	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	14	Disraeli.
"	5	Payment of Members	.	.	.	Do.	8	Opposes payment of members.
"	7	Irish Land Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	19	
"	8	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	11	Motion for Select Committee—Corrupt Practices.	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	26	Motion for Select Committee—Colonies	.	.	.	Do.	7	Explains Colonial policy.
"	27	Deceased Wife's Sister Bill	.	.	.	Do.	4	Supports Bill.
"	29	Education Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	
May	2	Conventual and Monastic Institutions.	.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	3	Public Schools	.	.	.	Do.	2	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>a</sup>	Remarks.
1870. May 5	Irish Land Bill	House of Commons	2	
" 9	Parliamentary Elections Bill	Do.	2	
" 10	Opium Revenue	Do.	7	
" 12	Women's Disabilities Bill	Do.	2	
" 13	Palace of Westminster (Case of Mr. Barry)	Do.	5	
" 17	East India (Council of State)	Do.	3	
" 19	Irish Land Bill	Do.	8	
" 20	Murder of British subjects in Greece.	Do.	9	
" 23	University Tests Bill.	Do.	9	
" 24	Established Church (Wales)	Do.	9	In support of Bill. Opposes motion in favour of dis- establishment. Third reading.
" 30	Irish Land Bill	Do.	7	
" 30	Exclusion of Reporters	Do.	2	
June 9	Inland Revenue Bill.	Do.	4	
" 13	Merchant Shipping Code Bill	Do.	2	
" 13	University Tests Bill	Do.	2	
" 14	Bible (Authorised Version).	Do.	5	
" 15	Representation of People Acts Amend- ment Bill.	Do.	7	
" 16	Elementary Education Bill	Do.	19	
" 21	Lords Spiritual Bill	Do.	13	Favours presence of bishops in House of Lords.
" 24	Elementary Education Bill	Do.	20	
" 28	East India Company	Do.	3	
" 28	Parochial Councils	Do.	4	
" 28	Elementary Education Bill	Do.	4	
" 30	Do.	Do.	9	On religious teaching in elemen- tary schools.

July	5	Ships <i>Bombay and Oneida</i>	.	.	Do.	5
"	8	Thames Embankment	.	.	Do.	6
"	14	Elementary Education Bill	.	.	Do.	6
"	21	France and Prussia—Neutral vessels	.	.	Do.	3
"	21	Spain—Choice of a King	.	.	Do.	1
"	21	Secret Service Money	.	.	Do.	1
"	21	Civil Service	.	.	Do.	2
"	22	Case of Mr. Mason—India	.	.	Do.	2
"	22	Statue of Viscount Gough	.	.	Do.	2
"	22	Elementary Education Bill	.	.	Do.	6
"	25	Office of Lord Privy Seal	.	.	Do.	3
"	26	Glebe Loans (Ireland) Bill	.	.	Do.	5
"	27	Ballot Bill	.	.	Do.	6
"	28	Meeting of Parliament Bill	.	.	Do.	2
Aug.	1	The War	.	.	Do.	13
"	2	Greece—Murder of British Subjects	.	.	Do.	11
"	5	East India Revenue Accounts	.	.	Do.	3
"	8	The Prayer Book	.	.	Do.	1
"	8	Neutrality of Belgium	.	.	Do.	5
"	10	Do.	.	.	Do.	10
Nov.	1	English Commerce and Foreign Com- petition.	.	.	London	
"	9	Franco-German War	.	.	Do.	
1871. Feb.	9	The Address	.	.	House of Commons	18
"	10	Black Sea Conference	.	.	Do.	1
"	10	University Tests Bill	.	.	Do.	5
"	13	Sir Denis le Marchant	.	.	Do.	1
"	13	Princess Louise.	.	.	Do.	9
"	16	Do.	.	.	Do.	1

Supports second reading.

Franco-German War and neu-  
trality of Belgium.

Workmen's International Exhibi-  
tion, London.

Lord Mayor's banquet.

Government's foreign policy—re-  
plies to Mr. Disraeli's criticisms.

Vote of thanks.

In support of dowry and annuity.  
do.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1871. Feb. 17	France and Germany	House of Commons	8	Defends foreign policy.
" 17	The Admiralty . . .	Do.	5	
" 20	University Tests Bill.	Do.	4	
" 21	The Pope—Letter of Mr. Gladstone	Do.	2	
" 23	East India Finance . . .	Do.	4	
" 23	University Tests Bill	Do.	2	
" 24	Messages to Germany	Do.	2	
" 24	Treaty of Paris (1856)	Do.	11	Replies to Mr. Disraeli's attack.
" 27	Entry of Germans into Paris	Do.	2	
" 28	Local Taxation . . .	Do.	4	
Mar. 2	West Meath—Unlawful combinations.	Do.	17	On Ribandism in West Meath.
" 3	France and Germany	Do.	3	
" 14	Official Salaries . . .	Do.	5	
" 17	Army Regulation Bill	Do.	13	Replies to criticisms on Mr. Cardwell's Bill.
" 21	Harbours of Refuge . . .	Do.	11	
" 23	Army Estimates . . .	Do.	10	
" 29	Parochial Councils Bill	Do.	7	
" 31	France and Prussia . . .	Do.	11	Explanation of Government policy.
April 3	Elections Bill . . .	Do.	2	
" 18	Post Office Sunday Labour	Do.	6	
" 18	Sir Spencer Robinson . . .	Do.	10	
" 21	Declaration of Paris (1856)	Do.	6	
" 24	National Expenditure . . .	Do.	13	Defends moderate increase in expenditure.
" 27	Ways and Means . . .	Do.	5	
May 1	Do.	Do.	14	

"	3	women's Disabilities Bill	.	.	.	Do.	7	On Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill granting parliamentary suffrage to single women.
"	4	Ways and Means	.	.	.	Do.	11	On reduction of National Debt.
"	9	Established Churches.	.	.	.	Do.	12	Opposes motion for disestablishment of the Church of England
"	23	University Tests Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	Reply to question.
"	26	Protection of Life, etc. (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	7	On the ballot.
June	12	Army Regulation Bill	.	.	.	Do.	5	Third reading.
"	13	Irish Land Act	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	15	Prayer Book Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	22	Elections Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	29	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	12	
"	30	Prayer Book Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	30	Abyssinian War Prize	.	.	.	Do.	3	
July	3	Army Regulation Bill	.	.	.	Do.	9	
"	4	Elections Bill	.	.	.	Do.	6	
"	14	Railways (Ireland)	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	20	Army (Purchase System)	.	.	.	Do.	7	Announces abolition of purchase by royal warrant.
"	24	Charges on Civil List	.	.	.	Do.	2	Reply to question.
"	24	Elections Bill	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	24	Secret Service Money	.	.	.	Do.	1	
"	31	Elections Bill	.	.	.	Do.	8	Reply to question.
"	31	Prince Arthur	.	.	.	Do.	8	Proposes annuity.
Aug.	2	University Tests (Dublin) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	14	Mr. Fawcett's Bill.
"	3	Prince Arthur	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	4	Treaty of Washington	.	.	.	Do.	9	
"	7	Loss of the <i>Megaera</i>	.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	8	Elections Bill	.	.	.	Do.	11	On obstruction to Bill.
"	11	Governor Eyre's Costs	.	.	.	Do.	2	Reply to question.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1871. Aug. 15	Army Regulation Bill	House of Commons	11	Defends abolition of purchase.
" " 15	Glebe Loan (Ireland) Act	Do.	1	
" " 17	Riots in Phoenix Park	Do.	13	
Sept. 2	Ballot Bill	Whitby		
" 5	Policy of the Government	Wakefield		Address to Liberal deputation.
" 26	Ireland and Home Rule	Aberdeen		On presentation of freedom of Aberdeen.
Oct. 23	Policy of the Government	Blackheath		See p. 401.
Nov. 9	Foreign Affairs	London		Lord Mayor's banquet.
1872. Feb. 6	The Address	House of Commons	16	Answers Mr. Disraeli's criticisms.
" 7	Do.	Do.	16	On Treaty of Washington.
" 8	Vote of Thanks to the Speaker	Do.	3	Moves vote of thanks to Speaker Denison.
" 8	Business of the House	Do.	3	
" 8	Deans and Canons Resignation Bill	Do.	1	
" 9	Choice of a Speaker	Do.	2	
" 13	Rectory of Ewelme	Do.	2	
" 19	Judicial Committee of the Privy Council	Do.	18	Answer to question.
" 20	Treaty of Washington	Do.		Defends Sir Robert Collier's appointment.
" 22	Royal Parks and Gardens Bill	Do.	3	
" 26	Breach of Privilege	Do.	2	
Mar. 1	General School of Law	Do.	1	
" 8	Rectory of Ewelme	Do.	4	
" 12	Parliamentary Business (Scotland)	Do.	13	Defends Mr. Harvey's appointment.
" 14	Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill.	Do.	5	
" 18	The Indirect Claims (United States)	Do.	4	

"	19	Civil List—Motion for Returns . . .	Do.	13	Answers Sir Charles Dilke's motion.
"	20	The Indirect Claims (United States) . .	Do.	2	
"	20	University Tests (Dublin) Bill . . .	Do.	9	
"	26	County Franchise Resolution . . .	Do.	6	On the extension of the rural franchise.
April	5	Working Men's Club . . .	Chesham		
"	9	Entailment of Land . . .	House of Commons	4	
"	12	Treaty Obligations of Intervention . .	Do.	7	
"	12	The Indirect Claims (United States) . .	Do.	2	
"	18	Pension to Lady Mayo . . .	Do.	2	
"	18	Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill.	Do.	5	
"	25	University Tests (Dublin) Bill . . .	Do.	9	
May	2	Unlawful Assemblies (Ireland) Bill . .	Do.	6	On the demand for Home Rule.
"	13	Treaty of Washington . . .	Do.	9	
"	14	Positive Religious Teaching . . .	London		Speech at King's College, London.
"	28	Treaty of Washington . . .	House of Commons	2	Answer to question.
"	28	Derby Day . . .	Do.	2	
"	30	Act of Uniformity Amendment Bill . .	Do.	3	
June	3	Treaty of Washington . . .	Do.	6	
"	3	Act of Uniformity Amendment Bill . .	Do.	2	
"	10	Civil Service Estimates . . .	Do.	2	
"	11	Treaty of Washington . . .	Do.	8	
"	14	France—denunciation of Treaty of Commerce.	Do.	6	
"	21	Law Officers of the Crown . . .	Do.	5	On proposed annexation.
"	25	Fiji Islands . . .	Do.	3	
"	27	Treaty of Washington . . .	Do.	7	
"	28	Parliamentary and Municipal Elections Bill.	Do.	5	On the Lords amendment to Ballot Bill.
July	1	Do. do.	Do.	2	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1872. July 2	Revenue of the Church of England .	House of Commons	6	Opposes inquiry into Church revenues.
" 8	Civil Service Estimates . . .	Do.	5	
" 15	Navy Estimates . . .	Do.	5	
" 23	Military Forces Localization Bill .	Do.	5	
" 24	Civic Institutions . . .	London		Lord Mayor's banquet.
" 25	Judgment of Mr. Justice Keogh .	House of Commons	2	
" 31	Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries Bill .	Do.	3	
Aug. 1	Local Taxation . . .	Do.	—	Answer to question.
" 5	Supply . . .	Do.	2	
" 8	Royal Gardens, Kew . . .	Do.	5	
Nov. 14	Arbitration . . .	Do.		
"	Legal Reforms . . .	London		At Middle Temple.
" 28	England and United States . . .	Do.		At American Thanksgiving dinner.
Dec. 3	Excavation in the East . . .	Do.		At Society of Biblical Archaeology.
" 21	Unbelief . . .	Liverpool		At Liverpool College.
1873. Feb. 6	The Address . . .	House of Commons	16	On the <i>Atabama</i> award.
" 13	University Education in Ireland .	Do.	49	Introduces Bill. See p. 426.
" 14	Treaties with Foreign Powers . .	Do.	10	
" 18	Public Expenditure . . .	Do.	14	
" 21	Departmental Expenditure . . .	Do.	2	
" 25	Meeting of Parliament . . .	Do.	5	
Mar. 3	University Education (Ireland) Bill .	Do.	8	
" 4	County Court Judges . . .	Do.	4	
" 5	Mr. Locke King, M.P. . . .	Croydon		Presentation to Mr. Locke King, M.P.
" 6	Irish University Bill . . .	Do.		
" 7	Defence of the Colonies . . .	House of Commons	2	
" 11	University Education (Ireland) Bill .	Do.	34	Second reading.

"	20	Resignation of Ministers	.	.	Do.	5	Explanation of crisis. <sup>2</sup>
"	21	International Law—The New Rules	.	.	Do.	8	On the Washington Treaty.
"	26	Bank Act	.	.	Do.	1	
"	26	Municipal Bodies	.	.	London		Lord Mayor's banquet to provincial Mayors.
"	28	Representative Peers	.	.	House of Commons	2	
April	1	India—Financial Statement	.	.	Do.	2	
"	3	Breach of Privilege— <i>Pall Mall Gazette</i>	.	.	Do.	1	
"	21	University Tests (Dublin) Bill	.	.	Do.	7	
"	22	Central Asia	.	.	Do.	3	
"	24	Spain—International Law	.	.	Do.	3	
"	24	Ways and Means	.	.	Do.	4	
"	29	Irish Railways	.	.	Do.	10	On proposed State purchase.
May	1	Ways and Means	.	.	Do.	14	On direct and indirect taxation.
"	2	Treaty of Washington	.	.	Do.	7	On the German Emperor's award on Canadian-American boundary.
"	6	Distribution of Electoral Power	.	.	Do.	7	
"	13	Emanuel Hospital Scheme.	.	.	Do.	13	
"	14	Occasional Sermons Bill	.	.	Do.	7	
"	16	Disestablishment in England and Wales	.	.	Do.	13	
"	26	Supply	.	.	Do.	9	On the <i>Alabama</i> award.
June	10	Rating Bill	.	.	Do.	2	
"	13	Protectorate of Fiji	.	.	Do.	11	
"	17	Church of Scotland—Patronage	.	.	Do.	4	
"	19	Rating Bill	.	.	Do.	2	
"	24	Canada Loan	.	.	Do.	3	
"	26	Rating Bill	.	.	Do.	2	
"	30	Supreme Court of Judicature	.	.	Do.	4	
July	1	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

<sup>2</sup> The ministry had resigned on March 13.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1873. July 3	Supreme Court of Judicature . . .	House of Commons	7	
" 4	Do.	Do.	4	
" 4	Irish Civil Servants . . .	Do.	7	
" 8	International Law . . .	Do.	9	
" 10	Appellate Jurisdiction of House of Lords	Do.	11	
" 14	Do.	Do.	4	
" 14	Supreme Court of Judicature . . .	Do.	3	
" 18	Canterbury Cathedral—Alleged pilgrim- age.	Do.	2	Answer to question.
" 21	Supreme Court of Judicature . . .	Do.	2	
" 21	Crown Private Estates Bill . . .	Do.	6	
" 22	Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill.	Do.	2	
" 25	Do.	Do.	2	
" 29	Duke of Edinburgh . . .	Do.	7	
" 29	Post Office—Telegraphs . . .	Do.	3	
" 30	Supply . . .	Do.	5	
" 31	Appropriation Bill . . .	Do.	3	
" 31	Duke of Edinburgh's Annuity Bill . . .	Do.	6	
Aug. 1	Do.	Do.	4	
" 15	School Boards . . .	Hawarden Mold		
" 19	Welsh Language . . .	London		At Welsh National Eisteddfod. Lord Mayor's banquet.
Nov. 9	Public Affairs . . .	Blackheath		
Jan. 28	General Election . . .	Woolwich		
" 31	Do.	New Cross		
Feb. 2	Do.	House of Commons	2	Replies to Mr. Disraeli's speeches.
Mar. 5	Election of Speaker . . .	Do.	13	On the recent dissolution.
" 19	The Address . . .			

"	20	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	10	On Mr. Butt's Home Rule motion. Speech at Willis' Rooms.
"	25	Newport Market Refuge	.	.	.	London		
"	30	Ashantee War	.	.	.	House of Commons	4	Vote of thanks.
April	23	Ways and Means	.	.	.	Do.	15	Criticizes Sir Stafford Northcote's budget.
"	24	Vote of Censure	.	.	.	Do.	14	
July	6	Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	18	Opposes Bill.
"	9	Public Worship Regulation Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	20	Explains his six resolutions and opposes Bill.
"	14	Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill	.	.	.	Do.	11	Opposes Bill.
"	17	Public Worship Regulation Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	21	Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill	.	.	.	Do.	12	
"	23	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	8	Do.
"	23	Prince Leopold.	.	.	.	Do.	1	Do.
"	24	Public Business.	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	31	Public Worship Regulation Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	9	
Aug.	3	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	4	Fiji Islands	.	.	.	Do.	5	Against premature annexation of Fiji.
"	5	Public Worship Regulation Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	6	
1875. Mar.	16	Regimental Exchanges Bill	.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	17	Bankers' Act Amendment Bill	.	.	.	Do.	6	
April	6	Brewers' Licence Duty	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	21	Burials Bill	.	.	.	Do.	5	In support of Bill.
May	5	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	5	Do.
"	6	Arrangement of Public Business	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	7	Financial Statement	.	.	.	Do.	24	Criticism of budget (Sir Stafford Northcote's).
"	27	Savings Banks Bill	.	.	.	Do.	11	
June	7	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	6	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard.	Remarks.
1875. July 8	National Debt Bill	House of Commons	7	On the Sinking Fund.
" " 15	Visit of Prince of Wales to India	Do.	4	
" " 16	Supreme Court of Judicature Act	Do.	4	
" " 22	Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill.	Do.	5	
Sept. 9	English Public Schools	Chester		At laying of foundation stone--- King's School, Chester.
" " 14	Mental Culture	Hawarden		At prize distribution to science and art students.
Nov. 11	Education.	Greenwich		On the Andrassy note and Crimean War.
1876. Feb. 8	The Address	House of Commons	5	
" " 14	Suez Canal Shares	Do.	3	At presentation of freedom of the Turners' Company.
" " 16	City Companies.	London		
" " 21	Suez Canal Shares	House of Commons	23	
Mar. 6	Exchequer Bonds	Do.	6	
" " 9	Royal Titles Bill	Do.	14	
" " 20	Do.	Do.	6	
" " 21	The Steamship <i>Talisman</i>	Do.	1	
" " 23	Royal Titles Bill	Do.	8	
" " 25	House of Charity, Soho	London		
April 7	Public Petitions	House of Commons	3	At annual meeting.
May 9	Fine Arts	Do.	5	
" " 12	Public Houses (Ireland)	Do.	7	
" " 18	Inland Revenue Bill.	Do.	10	
" " 23	City of London Companies	Do.	4	
" " 31	<i>Wealth of Nations</i>	London		Celebration of rooth anniversary of publication.

July 6	Knowledge	.	.	.	.	Do.	3	At prize distribution at King's College.
" 12	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill.	.	.	.	.	House of Commons		
" 13	Medical Education	.	.	.	.	London		At London Hospital Medical College.
" 21	Turkish Debt—Loan of 1854	.	.	.	.	House of Commons	7	In defence of Crimean War and European concert.
" 31	Insurrection in Bosnia	.	.	.	.	Do.	29	To deputation of Liberals.
Aug. 17	Cottage Gardening	.	.	.	.	Hawarden		Speech at St. James's Hall.
" 19	Public Affairs.	.	.	.	.	Do.		
Sept. 9	Bulgarian Atrocities	.	.	.	.	Blackheath Common		
Oct. 2	Berwick Museum	.	.	.	.	Berwick		
Dec. 9	Eastern Question	.	.	.	.	London.		
1877. Jan. 16	The Turks, the Greeks and the Slavs.	.	.	.	.	Hawarden		
" 22	Eastern Question	.	.	.	.	Bath		
" 27	Do.	.	.	.	.	Taunton		
Feb. 3	Value of Simple Habits	.	.	.	.	Marlborough College	8	Address to boys.
" 8	The Speech	.	.	.	.	House of Commons	24	On the Eastern Question.
" 16	Treaty of 1856.	.	.	.	.	Do.		Attacks Turkish policy of the Government.
" 28	Servian Relief Fund	.	.	.	.	London		At Grosvenor House.
Mar. 22	Preaching	.	.	.	.	Do.		At City Temple.
" 22	Excavations of Mycenæ	.	.	.	.	Do.		At Society of Antiquaries.
" 23	Turkey—Negotiations and Guarantees.	.	.	.	.	House of Commons	21	On futility of accepting Turkish promises without guarantees.
" 27	Sir Henry Elliott	.	.	.	.	Do.	11	
" 27	Privilege—Personal Explanations	.	.	.	.	Do.	5	
April 20	Debates—Official Reports	.	.	.	.	Do.	7	
" 24	Irish Parliament	.	.	.	.	Do.	2	On a motion in favour of.
May 7	Eastern Question	.	.	.	.	Do.	51	Moves first of his resolutions. <sup>2</sup>

See p. 470.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.  
<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gladstone had given notice of five resolutions on the Eastern Question on April 30.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard.	Remarks.
1877. May 12	Ceramic Art . . . . .	London Institution	20	At Cymmrodorian Society.
" 14	Eastern Question . . . . .	House of Commons		Closes debate on his first resolution.
" 31	Public Affairs . . . . .	Birmingham		Liberal demonstration at Bingley Hall.
June 1	Irish Question . . . . .	Do.		At Bristol Street Board School, Birmingham.
" 1	Do. . . . .	Do.		At Mayor's banquet.
" 1	Municipal Life . . . . .	Do.		
" 4	Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill.	House of Commons	7	Supports amendment providing that Heads of Colleges and Fellows need not be in Holy Orders.
" 14	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	1	
" 30	Caxton . . . . .	London		
July 6	Privilege—The Speaker	House of Commons	1	At opening of Caxton Exhibition.
" 13	Eastern Question . . . . .	Plymouth		
" 13	Do. . . . .	Exeter		
" 16	Bosnian Refugees . . . . .	London		
" 20	Pardon of Fenian Convicts	House of Commons		
" 27	The New Rules . . . . .	Do.	5	At Willis' Rooms.
Aug. 4	Eastern Question . . . . .	Hawarden	2	Speech to Liberal deputation.
" 18	Do. . . . .	Do.		Do.
" 20	Do. . . . .	Do.		Do.
Sept. 19	Education. . . . .	Do.		At Grammar School, Hawarden.
" 27	Higher Education . . . . .	Nottingham		At University College, Nottingham.
" 27	Eastern Question . . . . .	Do.		
Nov. 7	Irish Question . . . . .	Dublin		On presentation of the freedom of Dublin.

"	7	Irish Municipalities	.	.	.	Do.		
"	12	Eastern Question	.	.	.	Holyhead		
"	23	Russians, Turks and Bulgarians.	.	.	.	Hawarden		
1878. Jan.	17	The Address	.	.	.	House of Commons	4	On the Eastern policy of the Government.
"	30	Vote of Credit	.	.	.	Oxford		Speech at the Corn Exchange, Oxford.
"	30	Canning, Palmerston and the Liberal Party.	.	.	.			At Palmerston Club Dinner.
Feb.	4	Supplementary Estimate	.	.	.	House of Commons	31	
"	8	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	18	
"	11	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	3	
Mar.	19	Indian Press Law	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	29	Russia and England	.	.	.	Do.	1	
"	23	Economy in Public Expenditure	.	.	.	London		To deputation of Greenwich liberals.
"	28	Eastern Question	.	.	.	Do.		To deputation from Leeds.
April	1	Army Reserves	.	.	.	House of Commons	3	
"	1	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill.	.	.	.	Do.	2	Supports Bill.
"	3	Vaccination Law (Penalties) Bill <sup>1</sup>	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	4	Financial Statement	.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	5	Berlin Congress	.	.	.	Do.	8	
"	6		.	.	.	London		At Institute of Civil Engineers.
"	8	Army Reserves	.	.	.	House of Commons	25	On the Eastern policy of the Government.
"	11	Public Business.	.	.	.	Do.	1	
"	18	Eastern Question	.	.	.	London		At conference of London Non-conformist Ministers.
May	1	Thrift	.	.	.	Hawarden		
"	8	Public Affairs	.	.	.	Do.		Deputation from Northern Counties Liberal Association.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1878. May 21	Military Forces of the Crown	House of Commons	21	To deputation of Scotch Presbyterian ministers. Protests against despatch of Indian troops to Malta.
" 23	Eastern Question	London		
" 27	The Indian Contingent	House of Commons	7	
June 11	Friendly Societies	Hawarden		
" 13	Treaties of 1855 and 1871.	House of Commons	5	
" 17	"The Nineteenth Century"	Do.	3	
" 18	Religious Denominations (Scotland)	Do.	8	
July 6	Homer	Eton		
" 11	Administration of Charity	London		
" 15	Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill.	House of Commons	9	
" 16	Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill	Do.	6	
" 20	Anglo-Turkish Convention	Bermondsey		
" 23	Indian Vernacular Press Act	House of Commons	22	
" 25	Marriage of Duke of Connaught	Do.	6	
" 30	Eastern Affairs	Do.	53	Criticizes action of British plenipotentiaries at Berlin Congress. See p. 505.
Aug. 5	Civil Service Estimates	Do.		
" 6	Ways and Means	Do.	3	
" 15	Art Labour	Hawarden	9	
Oct. 2	Education.	Isle of Man		
" 4	Isle of Man Constitution	Do.		
" 31	Eastern Question	Rhyl		
Nov. 11	Books	Buckley		
" 30	Liberal Organization	Greenwich		At King William's College.
" 30	Afghan War	Woolwich		Reply to address at Ramsey.
Dec. 5	The Address	House of Commons	3	

"	10	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	30	On Afghan War.
"	16	Afghan War—Expenses	.	.	.	Do.	10	Protests against Indian revenue being charged with Afghan war charges.
"	16	Rhodope Commission.	.	.	.	Do.	4	
1879. Feb.	10	Life and Labours of Dr. Hook	.	.	.	Hawarden		
April	1	Wellington College	.	.	.	House of Commons	7	
"	3	Financial Statement	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	17	Treaty of Berlin	.	.	.	Do.	6	
"	21	Eastern Question	.	.	.	Mentmore		
"	25	Charity Commission	.	.	.	House of Commons	4	
"	28	National Expenditure	.	.	.	Do.	28	
May	2	Irish Land Act, 1870	.	.	.	Do.	4	Supports resolution enabling Irish tenants to purchase their holdings.
"	5	Ways and Means	.	.	.	Do.	9	Defends his financial policy of 1860
"	13	Prerogative of the Crown	.	.	.	Do.	6	
"	19	Home Missions	.	.	.	London		At Willis' Rooms.
"	22	East India Revenue Accounts	.	.	.	House of Commons	3	
"	27	Zulu War	.	.	.	Do.	3	
June	11	Education.	.	.	.	Mill Hill School		
"	12	East India Revenue Accounts	.	.	.	House of Commons	14	
"	14	Politics and Literature	.	.	.	London		
"	20	Motion for Papers—Cyprus	.	.	.	House of Commons	10	
July	1	Education (Wales)	.	.	.	Do.	6	At Savage Club.
"	5	Homer	.	.	.	Eton		
"	11	Proceedings of the House—Privilege	.	.	.	House of Commons	3	
"	15	Army Discipline Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	17	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	24	University Education (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	25	East India Loan Bill	.	.	.	Do.	3	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1879. July 27	Congress of Berlin . . . . .	House of Commons	16	
Aug. 11	Art and Manufacture . . . . .	Chester		At opening of Fine Art Exhibition.
" 19	Eastern Question . . . . .	Do.		
" 21	Address to Inmates of Workhouse . . . . .	London.		At St. Pancras Workhouse.
" 28	Garden Cultivation . . . . .	Hawarden		
Nov. 3	Knowledge . . . . .	Wellington College		Midlothian Campaign. See p. 553.
" 25	Eastern Question . . . . .	Edinburgh		Do.
" 26	Home Affairs . . . . .	Dalkeith		Do.
" 27	Eastern Question . . . . .	West Calder		Deputation of Leith Council.
" 27	Public Affairs . . . . .	Dalmeny		Midlothian Campaign.
" 29	Tory Finance . . . . .	Edinburgh		
" 29	Balkan Principalities . . . . .	Do.		
Dec. 1	Public Affairs . . . . .	Dunfermline		
" 1	Do. . . . .	Perth		
" 1	Do. . . . .	Dunkeld		
" 1	Do. . . . .	Aberfeldy		
" 5	Inaugural Address . . . . .	Glasgow University		
" 5	European, Indian and South African Affairs.	Glasgow		
" 7	Public Affairs . . . . .	Motherwell		Do.
" 7	Do. . . . .	Hamilton		Do.
" 9	Eastern Question . . . . .	Wigan		
1880. Feb. 27	Political Situation . . . . .	London (St. Pancras)		
" 27	Business of the House . . . . .	House of Commons	7	On rules dealing with obstruction.
" Mar. 5	Intoxicating Liquors (Licences) . . . . .	Do.	10	
" 11	Financial Statement . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 12	Expenses of military operations . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 15	Probates of Wills, etc. . . . .	Do.	7	Criticizes Budget.
" 17	Eastern Question . . . . .	Edinburgh		

"	18	Eastern Question	.	.	.	Corserphine	On Anglo-Turkish Convention
"	18	Neglect of Domestic Legislation	.	.	.	Ratho	Indictment of Government.
"	19	Political Situation	.	.	.	Davidson's Main	Replies to Tory criticisms.
"	19	The Government and Class Interests	.	.	.	Dalkeith	Do.
"	20	Political Situation	.	.	.	Juniper Green	Inauguration of Liberal Club.
"	20	Do.	.	.	.	Balerno	
"	20	Abridgement of Rights of Parliament.	.	.	.	Midcalder	
"	22	Church Disestablishment	.	.	.	Gilmerton	
"	22	Eastern Question	.	.	.	Loanhead	
"	23	Political Situation	.	.	.	Edinburgh	
"	23	Eastern Question	.	.	.	Gorebridge	
"	23	Do.	.	.	.	Pathhead	
"	25	Cyprus	.	.	.	Penycuik	
"	29	Political Situation	.	.	.	Dalmeny	
"	30	Do.	.	.	.	Peebles	
"	30	Do.	.	.	.	Innerleithen	
"	30	Finance	.	.	.	Stow	
"	31	Political Situation	.	.	.	Edinburgh	
April	1	Do.	.	.	.	Bonnyrigg	Shortcomings of the Government and Liberal record.
"	2	Do.	.	.	.	West Calder	
"	6	Do.	.	.	.	Linlithgow	
May	20	The Address	.	.	.	House of Commons	Turkish Policy.
"	21	Parliamentary Oath	.	.	.	Do.	Mr. Bradlaugh's case.
"	21	The Address	.	.	.	Do.	
"	25	Disarmament of the Basutos	.	.	.	Do.	On South African federation.
"	27	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	.	Do.	
"	31	Parliamentary Oath	.	.	.	Do.	Mr. Bradlaugh's case.
June	1	Cyprus	.	.	.	Do.	
"	1	<i>Congé d'elire</i> Bill	.	.	.	Do.	
"	3	Employers' Liability Bill	.	.	.	Do.	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1880. June 4	Opium Trade . . . . .	House of Commons	6	
" 10	Financial Statement . . . . .	Do.	39	Introduces supplementary Budget.
" 14	M. Chattermel Lacour . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 16	European Armaments . . . . .	Do.	9	On reduction of armaments.
" 18	Savings Banks Bill . . . . .	Do.	9	
" 18	Intoxicating Liquors (Licences) . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 22	Mr. Bradlaugh . . . . .	Do.	18	
" 24	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill . . . . .	Do.	14	
July 1	Parliamentary Affirmation . . . . .	Do.	8	Mr. Bradlaugh's case.
" 5	Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	20	
" 6	Employers' Liability Bill . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 8	Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	2	
" 9	University Tests . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 13	Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	7	
" 15	Do. do. do.	Do.	5	
" 16	Do. do. do.	Do.	6	
" 16	Prince Louis Napoleon . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 20	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill . . . . .	Do.	16	
" 21	Do. do. do.	Do.	2	
" 23	Do. do. do.	Do.	2	
" 23	Armenia, Asia Minor and Syria . . . . .	Do.	8	Explains Government's policy.
" 26	Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	13	
" 28	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill . . . . .	Do.	5	
Sept. 4	Treaty of Berlin . . . . .	Do.	10	On Turkish policy of Government.
Nov. 9	Ireland and Foreign and Colonial Questions.	London		Speech at Lord Mavor's banquet.

1881.	Jan.	6	The Address	House of Commons	19
"	"	17	Do.	Do.	6
"	"	21	Annexation of the Transvaal	Do.	8
"	"	25	Business of the House	Do.	6
"	"	28	Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	22
Feb.	"	2	Privilege	Do.	2
"	"	3	Business of the House	Do.	14
"	"	10	Privilege	Do.	3
"	"	17	Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	3
"	"	18	Do.	Do.	5
Mar.	"	11	Ancient Monuments	Do.	2
"	"	15	Assassination of the Emperor of Russia (Alexander II).	Do.	4
"	"	16	Afghan War—Supply	Do.	7
"	"	21	Privilege	Do.	3
"	"	28	Highways	Do.	7
"	"	29	Patronage of Benefices (Church of England).	Do.	4
April	"	1	New Writ for Northampton	Do.	2
"	"	4	The Budget	Do.	33
"	"	4	Army Discipline Bill	Do.	2
"	"	5	Evictions (Ireland)	Do.	3
"	"	7	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	Do.	36
"	"	8	Easter Recess	Do.	3
"	"	25	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	Do.	2
"	"	26	Parliamentary Oath	Do.	10
"	"	27	Do.	Do.	8
"	"	29	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	Do.	1
"	"	29	Power of Representatives Abroad	Do.	10

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1881. May 2	Parliamentary Oaths Bill . . .	House of Commons	3	Mr. Bradlaugh's case.
" 4	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Wales) .	Do.	5	Supports Welsh Sunday Closing Bill.
" 5	Operations in Afghanistan	Do.	2	Tribute to Lord Beaconsfield.
" 9	Monument to Lord Beaconsfield . .	Do.	7	
" 10	Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	2	
" 13	Mr. Bradlaugh . . .	Do.	4	
" 13	Minister of Agriculture and Commerce.	Do.	9	
" 16	France and Tunis . . .	Do.	3	
" 16	Land Law (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	24	
" 20	Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act (1881)	Do.	5	
" 23	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill . .	Do.	5	On second reading.
" 26	Land Law (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	3	
" 27	Do.	Do.	4	
" 30	Privilege . . .	Do.	3	Mr. P. Egan.
" 31	Land Law (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	4	
June 3	Do.	Do.	6	
" 10	Law of Entail . . .	Do.	6	
" 13	Land Law (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	3	
" 16	Do.	Do.	4	
" 17	Do.	Do.	2	
" 20	Do.	Do.	2	
" 24	Anglo-Turkish Convention . . .	Do.	10	
" 30	Land Law (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	3	
July 1	Do.	Do.	2	
" 5	New French General Tariff	Do.	4	
" 5	Land Law (Ireland) Bill . . .	Do.	8	

"	7	Do.	.	.	Do.	5
"	11	Do.	.	.	Do.	5
"	12	Do.	.	.	Do.	11
"	14	Mr. Northcote and Mr. Biggar	.	.	Do.	1
"	18	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	.	.	Do.	2
"	19	Do.	.	.	Do.	3
"	20	Do.	.	.	Do.	5
"	20	Transvaal Rising	.	.	Do.	3
"	21	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	.	.	Do.	5
"	22	Do.	.	.	Do.	6
"	25	Transvaal Rising	.	.	Do.	18
"	26	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	.	.	Do.	3
"	28	Royal Parks	.	.	Do.	2
"	29	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	.	.	Do.	6
Aug.	3	Mr. Bradlaugh	.	.	Do.	2
"	4	Suspension of Mr. O'Kelly.	.	.	Do.	5
"	6	Government Record	.	.	Mansion House	
"	11	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	.	.	House of Commons	
"	15	Do.	.	.	Do.	4
"	18	Irish Executive	.	.	Do.	6
"	23	Appropriation Bill (Foreign Policy)	.	.	Do.	10
"	23	Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill.	.	.	Do.	4
Oct.	7	Land and "Fair Trade"	.	.	Do.	2
"	7	Ireland	.	.	Leeds	
"	8	Free Trade	.	.	Do.	
"	8	Foreign and Colonial Policy	.	.	Do.	
"	13	Ireland	.	.	Do.	
"	27	Do.	.	.	Guildhall, London	
Nov.	9	Do.	.	.	Knowsley	
		Procedure}	.	.	Mansion House	

On vote of censure.

Third reading.

Freedom of City conferred.

On Mr. Parnell's vote of censure.

Arrest of Mr. Parnell.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1882. Jan. 12	Agriculture	Hawarden London		
" 31	Local Taxation .			
Feb. 7	Parliamentary Oath .	House of Commons	6	Reply to deputation from Chambers of Agriculture.
" 7	Privilege .	Do.	5	Mr. Bradlaugh's case.
" 8	The Address .	Do.	23	Mr. Parnell's arrest.
" 9	Do.	Do.	7	
" 16	Do.	Do.	8	
" 20	New Procedure Rules	Do.	28	On Home Rule amendment.
" 21	Local Taxation .	Do.	5	On Irish demand for Home Rule.
" 21	Mr. Bradlaugh .	Do.	3	
" 22	Do.	Do.	7	
" 24	Supply .	Do.	2	New writ for Northampton.
" 27	Land Law (Ireland) Bill	Do.	16	
Mar. 3	Persecution of Jews in Russia .	Do.	5	On House of Lords committee.
" 3	Warrant against Members of the House	Do.	1	
" 6	The Address .	Do.	2	The attempt on the Queen's life.
" 6	Mr. Bradlaugh .	Do.	2	In support of legislation on parliamentary oaths.
" 7	Irish Land Act .	Do.	2	Personal explanation.
" 10	Irish Railways .	Do.	2	Proposed State acquisition of railways in Ireland.
" 13	Protection of Persons and Property (Ireland) Act, 1881.	Do.	3	
" 15	Land Law (Ireland) Bill .	Do.	5	
" 16	Ways and Means .	Do.	4	
" 17	British North Borneo Company .	Do.	8	
" 21	Parliamentary Reform .	Do.	7	
" 23	Prince Leopold .	Do.	10	On grant to Prince Leopold (Duke of Albany)

"	24	British Trade	.	.	.	Do.	5
"	28	Supply	.	.	.	Do.	8
"	30	New Procedure Rules	.	.	.	Do.	15
"	31	Ecclesiastical Commission	.	.	.	Do.	5
April	3	Provincial Art Galleries and Museums	.	.	.	Do.	4
"	4	Crime—Ireland	.	.	.	Do.	9
"	17	Cetewayo	.	.	.	Do.	7
"	18	Papal See	.	.	.	Do.	10
"	24	The Budget	.	.	.	Do.	33
"	26	Land Law (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill	.	.	.	Do.	10
"	28	£1 Bank Notes	.	.	.	Do.	5
May	1	Business of the House	.	.	.	Do.	5
"	2	Ireland—Ministerial Statement	.	.	.	Do.	5
"	4	Mr. Forster's Resignation	.	.	.	Do.	8
"	8	Assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke.	.	.	.	Do.	1
"	15	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	11
"	16	Irish Policy of the Government.	.	.	.	Do.	8
"	19	Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	11
"	22	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	6
"	24	Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	12
"	26	Egypt	.	.	.	Do.	7
June	7	Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	5
"	12	Do.	.	do.	.	Do.	2
"	13	Do.	.	do.	.	Do.	2
"	14	Egypt	.	.	.	Do.	7
"	20	Ministerial Statement	.	.	.	Do.	7
"	22	Suez Canal	.	.	.	Do.	3
"	22	Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Bill	.	.	.	Do.	4

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1882. July 5	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	House of Commons	4	
" 7	Prevention of Crime (Ireland) Bill	Do.	5	
" 10	Autumn Session	Do.	3	
" 10	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	Do.	5	
" 11	do.	Do.	4	
" 12	Egypt	Do.	6	Bombardment of Alexandria.
" 13	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	Do.	3	
" 17	do.	Do.	5	
" 17	Resignation of Mr. Bright	Do.	—	
" 18	Egypt	Do.	2	
" 19	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	Do.	3	
" 21	do.	Do.	3	On third reading.
" 24	Forces in the Mediterranean	Do.	17	Asks for vote of credit for £2,300,000.
" 27	Do.	Do.	11	Concludes debate on vote of credit.
" 28	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	Do.	13	On national expenditure.
" 31	Egypt	Do.	1	Expenses of military expedition.
Aug. 8	Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill	Do.	12	On Lords amendments.
" 8	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	2	
" 9	Privilege	Do.	8	
" 10	Egypt	Do.	8	
" 14	New Rules of Procedure	Do.	3	
" 14	Spanish Wines	Do.	2	
" 16	Appropriation Bill	Do.	12	
" 17	Commitment of a Member.	Do.	6	
Oct. 3	Public Affairs, Egypt	Penmaenmawr		On the suspension of Irish members.
" 24	Appropriation Act	House of Commons	10	
" 24	Privilege	Do.	3	Case of Mr. E. Dwyer Gray, M.P.

"	24	New Rules of Procedure	.	.	Do.	10	
"	25	Do.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	26	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	Moves vote of thanks to forces engaged in campaign.
"	26	Egypt	.	.	Do.	18	
"	27	New Rules of Procedure	.	.	Do.	3	Roman Catholics and appointments.
"	27	Ireland	.	.	Do.	2	
"	31	New Rules of Procedure	.	.	House of Commons	19	
Nov.	6	Do.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	8	Do.	.	.	Do.	12	
"	9	Ireland and Egypt	.	.	London		Lord Mayor's banquet.
"	14	New Rules of Procedure	.	.	House of Commons	4	
"	14	Egypt	.	.	Do.	4	Employment of forces.
"	24	Mr. Parnell	.	.	Do.	10	Mr. Parnell's release from Kilmainham.
"	27	New Rules of Procedure	.	.	Do.	15	
"	28	Irish Land Commission	.	.	Do.	6	
"	30	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	
1883. Mar.	5	Navy—Supplementary Estimates	.	.	Do.	4	
"	5	Transvaal	.	.	Do.	4	
"	9	Seizure of the <i>Florence</i> —Jamaica	.	.	Do.	5	
"	14	Land Law (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill.	.	.	Do.	10	
"	16	Transvaal	.	.	Do.	16	The Boer invasion of Bechuana-land.
"	20	Bankruptcy Bill	.	.	Do.	5	
"	29	Commissioners of Woods	.	.	Do.	5	
April	3	River Congo	.	.	Do.	6	
"	3	Channel Tunnel	.	.	Do.	4	
"	5	Financial Statement	.	.	Do.	1	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard.	Remarks.
1883, April 6	National Expenditure . . .	House of Commons	16	
" 17	Local Taxation . . .	Do.	8	
" 17	Mr. Bradlaugh . . .	Do.	2	
" 19	Lord Alcester's Annuity Bill . . .	Do.	6	
" 19	Lord Wolsley's Annuity Bill . . .	Do.	2	
" 26	Parliamentary Oaths Act (1866) Amendment Bill.	Do.	22	See p. 580.
" 27	Local Option . . .	Do.	3	
May 2	Political Situation . . .	National Liberal Club		
" 4	Mr. Bradlaugh . . .	House of Commons	1	
" 7	Contagious Diseases Acts . . .	Do.	4	
" 11	Expulsion of Cuban Refugees from Gibraltar.	Do.	2	
" 25	Armenia and European Turkey . . .	Do.	5	
" 29	State of Public Business . . .	Foreign Office		
June 1	Privilege—Mr. O'Kelly . . .	House of Commons	5	
" 1	Inland Revenue (Circular) . . .	Do.	5	
" 2	Garibaldi . . .	Stafford House		
" 7	Corrupt Practices Bill . . .	House of Commons	5	
" 7	Supply—Report . . .	Do.	3	
" 8	Lord Alcester's Grant Bill . . .	Do.	9	
" 8	Trial of Suleiman Sami . . .	Do.	3	
" 11	Do.	Do.	6	
" 11	Lord Wolsley's Grant Bill . . .	Do.	3	
" 12	Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881 . . .	Do.	9	
" 18	Privilege—Mr. John Bright . . .	Do.	9	
" 29	Minister of Education . . .	Do.	12	
July 2	Corrupt Practices Bill . . .	Do.	6	
				On revision of purchase clauses

"	12	Prince Lucien Bonaparte—Pension	Do.	3	On withdrawal of provisional agreement.
"	23	Suez (Second) Canal—M. de Lesseps	Do.	11	India and expenses of Egyptian campaign.
"	27	India—Expenditure	Do.	8	On future negotiations.
"	30	Suez Canal	Do.	12	
Aug.	6	Egypt—Policy of the Government	Do.	3	
"	6	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	17	
"	7	National Debt Bill	Do.	9	
"	9	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	8	
"	11	Bankruptcy Bill	Do.	2	
"	18	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	5	
"	20	Supply—Commander Heron Maxwell	Do.	2	
"	21	Appropriation Bill	Do.	12	
Sept.	13	Political changes during half century	Kirkwall		
Nov.	9	Public Affairs, Egypt.	London		Lord Mayor's banquet.
"	19	Education	Winchester College		
Dec.	22	Reform	Hawarden		
1884.	Jan. 5	Agriculture	Do.		
"	31	Franchise Bill	Do.		
Feb.	6	The Address	House of Commons	8	Deputations from Leeds Conference.
"	7	Do.	Do.	6	
"	11	Mr. Bradlaugh	Do.	5	On Mr. Bradlaugh's attempt to take the oath.
"	11	The Soudan	Do.	2	
"	12	Do.	Do.	28	Replies to vote of censure.
"	13	Standing Committees.	Do.	4	
"	14	The Soudan	Do.	2	
"	21	Mr. Bradlaugh	Do.	3	
"	22	Queen's Speech—Report	Do.	2	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1884. Feb. 25	Speaker Brand's retirement	House of Commons	2	Moves resolution of thanks.
" 25	The Soudan	Do.	3	
" 25	Standing Committees.	Do.	3	
" 26	Election of Speaker	Do.	2	
" 28	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	28	Explains provisions of the Bill.
Mar. 3	The Soudan	Do.	6	Defends retention of Suakin.
" 6	Army—Supplementary Estimate	Do.	12	
" 7	Vote of Credit	Do.	1	
" 31	Death of the Duke of Albany	Do.	3	
April 1	Orders of the Day	Do.	3	
" 3	Egypt	Do.	9	General Gordon's mission.
" 7	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	18	Second reading.
" 25	Local and Imperial Taxation	Do.	12	
" 28	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	8	
May 1	Do.	Do.	10	
" 2	Sittings of the House	Do.	6	
" 6	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	3	
" 12	General Gordon's Mission	Do.	22	On vote of censure.
" 15	Ways and Means	Do.	3	
" 16	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	5	
" 22	Civil Service	Do.	5	
" 23	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	2	
" 26	Do.	Do.	8	
" 9	Do.	Do.	2	
June 10	Do.	Do.	9	Opposes amendment granting suffrage to women.
" 13	Do.	Do.	7	
" 19	Do.	Do.	3	
" 23	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday	Do.	1	

"	23	Egypt—Proposed Conference	.	.	Do.	15	On terms of agreement with France.
"	26	Representation of the People Bill	.	.	Do.	6	Third reading.
"	27	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	
July	3	Crew of the <i>Nisero</i>	.	.	Do.	4	Second reading.
"	8	London Government Bill	.	.	Do.	17	On rejection of Franchise Bill by the House of Lords.
"	10	Ministerial Statement	.	.	Do.	7	The negotiations with Lord Cairns.
"	11	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	At Willis' Rooms.
"	11	Political Situation	.	.	London		
"	18	Politics of the Past and Future.	.	.	Eighty Club		
"	23	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	House of Commons	5	
"	25	Public Business	.	.	Do.	2	
"	30	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	Do.	6	
Aug.	2	Egypt	.	.	Do.	9	On failure of finance conference.
"	4	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	Do.	10	
"	5	Vote of Credit	.	.	Do.	7	Relief of General Gordon.
"	9	Bishopric of Bristol Bill	.	.	Do.	7	
"	11	Appropriation Bill	.	.	Do.	13	On Lord Northbrook's mission to Egypt.
"	30	Franchise Bill	.	.	Edinburgh		
Sept.	1	Political Situation	.	.	Do.		The House of Lords and the Bill Defends his administration.
"	2	Do.	.	.	Do.		On Lords' demand for dissolution.
"	17	Do.	.	.	Aberdeen		
"	17	Do.	.	.	Stonehaven		
"	17	Do.	.	.	Brechin		
"	24	Do.	.	.	Perth		
"	24	Do.	.	.	Stirling		
"	24	Do.	.	.	Larbert		
"	24	Do.	.	.	Grahamstown		
"	24	Do.	.	.	Wirral Railway		
Oct.	16	Railway Enterprise	.	.			

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1884. Oct. 23	Queen's Speech	House of Commons	16	On Franchise Bill.
" 28	Do.	Do.	18	Defends Lord Spencer's Irish administration.
" 30	Do.	Do.	11	
Nov. 5	Representation of the People Bill	Do.	2	Second reading.
" 6	do.	Do.	9	
" 10	do.	Do.	7	
" 11	do.	Do.	10	Ministerial statement.
" 17	Redistribution .	Do.	2	
" 17	Ways and Means	Do.	12	
" 20	Redistribution Bill	Do.	2	
" 21	House of Lords	Do.	7	
Dec. 1	Redistribution Bill	Do.	13	On motion by Mr. Labouchere for reform of House of Lords.
" 4	Do.	Do.	8	
1885. Feb. 19	Egypt	Do.	6	Ministerial statement.
" 20	Military Co-operation of the Colonies	Do.	3	
" 23	Egypt	Do.	21	On vote of censure on Soudan policy.
Mar. 6	Redistribution Bill	Do.	1	
" 10	Bengal Tenancy Bill	Do.	3	
" 12	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	5	
" 13	Redistribution Bill	Do.	7	
" 17	Do.	Do.	2	
" 23	Egypt	Do.	7	Moves ratification of Egyptian financial agreement.
" 26	Egyptian Loan	Do.	17	Announces Russian occupation of Penjdeh.
April 9	Central Asia	Do.	4	

"	16	Egyptian Loan Bill	.	.	.	Do.	10	In defence of Bill.
"	21	Vote of Credit	.	.	.	Do.	5	Asks for vote of credit for war preparations.
"	27	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	18	On Soudan and Afghanistan.
"	30	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	1	Announces agreement with Russia on Afghan boundary dispute.
May	4	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	8	
"	11	Consolidated Fund Bill	.	.	.	Do.	12	
"	12	Registration Bill	.	.	.	Do.	12	On dowry for Princess Beatrice.
"	14	Princess Beatrice	.	.	.	Do.	6	
"	15	Forestry Select Committee.	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	18	Civil Services	.	.	.	Do.	9	
"	21	Adjournment	.	.	.	Do.	11	
June	4	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	.	Do.	5	Defends increase of beer and spirit duties.
"	8	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	.	.	.	Do.	15	
"	12	Resignation of Government	.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	15	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	2	
"	19	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	2	
July	6	Mr. Bradlaugh	.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	7	Business of the House	.	.	.	Do.	17	On the proposals of the Irish party.
Nov.	9	Ireland	.	.	.	Edinburgh		
"	11	Disestablishment	.	.	.	Do.		
"	17	Ireland, Free Trade and Foreign Policy	.	.	.	West Calder		
"	21	Land Reform, Finance	.	.	.	Dalkeith		
"	23	History of Market Cross, Edinburgh	.	.	.	Edinburgh		
"	24	Mr. Parnell and Political Situation	.	.	.	Do.		
1886. Jan.	13	Election of a Speaker	.	.	.	House of Commons	3	Government's policy in India, Near East and Ireland.
"	21	The Address	.	.	.	Do.	20	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard.	Remarks.
1886. Jan. 25	The Address . . . . .	House of Commons	7	
" 26	Do. . . . .	Do.	8	Supports amendment for allotments.
Feb. 18	Policy of the Government . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 18	The Address . . . . .	Do.	9	
" 22	Parliamentary Procedure . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 22	Burmah . . . . .	Do.	7	On annexation of Burmah.
" 23	Imperial Revenue . . . . .	Do.	6	On Ireland's contribution to the Imperial revenue.
" 24	Tenure of Town Houses (Ireland) Bill.	Do.	3	
Mar. 1	Civil Service Estimates . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 4	Maintenance of Social Order (Ireland) .	Do.	13	
" 5	Representative Government . . . . .	Do.	6	
" 19	Crown Duties . . . . .	Do.	2	
" 19	National Engagements . . . . .	Do.	8	
" 22	Army (Auxiliary Forces) . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 30	Church of Scotland (Disestablishment)	Do.	6	
April 7	Death of Mr. Forster . . . . .	Do.	1	[See p. 601.
" 8	Government of Ireland Bill . . . . .	Do.	48	Introduction of Home Rule Bill.
" 13	Do. . . . .	Do.	16	Explains provisions of Irish Land Purchase scheme.
" 16	Land (Ireland) Bill . . . . .	Do.	32	
" 16	Sir Thomas Erskine May . . . . .	Do.	2	
May 10	Government of Ireland Bill . . . . .	Do.	28	Second reading.
" 20	Arms Bill . . . . .	Do.	5	
" 24	Government of Ireland Bill . . . . .	Do.	4	
" 24	Civil Services . . . . .	Do.	2	
June 7	Government of Ireland Bill . . . . .	Do.	25	



Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1887. April 25	Ways and Means . . . . .	House of Commons	20	Criticizes Mr. Goschen's Budget.
" 29	Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill	Do.	4	
May 2	Do. do.	Do.	3	
" 3	<i>The Times</i> and Mr. Dillon. . . .	Do.	4	
" 5	Do. . . . .	Do.	19	
" 11	Ireland . . . . .	London		
" 17	Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill	House of Commons	5	
" 31	Do. do.	Hawarden		
June 4	Do. do.	Swansea		
" 6	Welsh Nationality and Welsh Grievances }	Singleton Abbey		
" 7	Home Rule . . . . .	Cardiff		
" 10	Do. . . . .	House of Commons	7	
" 17	Business of the House . . . . .	Do.	3	
" 20	Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill	Do.	2	
" 27	Privilege . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 30	Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill	Do.	3	
July 2	Do. do.	London		Address to the Liberal members for Durham.
" 4	Lord Hartington's Irish Record . .	House of Commons	4	
" 7	Orders of the Day . . . . .	Do.	17	
" 14	Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill	Do.	7	Moves rejection of the Bill.
" 16	Land Bill (Ireland) . . . . .	National Liberal Club		
" 18	Ireland—Home Rule Movement in Scotland and Wales.	House of Commons	2	
" 21	Privilege—Dr. Tanner . . . . .	Do.		
" 29	Do. . . . .	London	5	
" 29	Political Situation . . . . .			Address to Liberal and Radical Union.

"	16	Railway Enterprise and the Channel Tunnel.	.	.	.	Connahs Quay			
"	25	Irish National League	.	.	.	House of Commons	19	On proclamation of the Irish Land League.	
"	30	Queen Victoria's Reign	.	.	.	Hawarden			
Sept. 12	12	Appropriation Bill	.	.	.	House of Commons	13	On the Mitchelstown riot.	
Oct. 4	4	Coercion	.	.	.	Hawarden			
"	18	Ireland and Police Methods	.	.	.	Nottingham			
"	19	Home Rule	.	.	.	Do.			National Liberal Federation.
"	20	Do.	.	.	.	Derby			
Dec. 27	27	Do.	.	.	.	Dover			
		Free Trade	.	.	.				
1888. Feb. 9	9	The Address	.	.	.	House of Commons	16		
"	13	Arrest of Mr. P. O'Brien	.	.	.	Do.	5		
"	17	The Address	.	.	.	Do.	32		
"	22	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	5		
"	24	Business of the House	.	.	.	Do.	2		
"	29	Business of the House—Procedure	.	.	.	Do.	3		
Mar. 1	1	Civil Service Estimates	.	.	.	Do.	2		
"	6	Procedure	.	.	.	Do.	6		
"	9	National Debt Acts	.	.	.	Do.	4		
"	19	Local Government Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2		
"	20	National Debt Conversion Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2		
"	23	Perpetual Pensions	.	.	.	Do.	5		
"	27	Land Commission Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2		
April 9	9	Ways and Means	.	.	.	Do.	12		
"	11	The Budget and Local Government Bill	.	.	.	National Liberal Club			
"	12	Disturbance at Ennis	.	.	.	House of Commons	4		Favours equalizing death duties on real and personal property.
"	23	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	.	.	.	Do.	23		

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1888, April 24	Ireland	House of Commons	7	On increase of sentences on appeal.
" 25	County Government (Ireland) Bill	Do.	5	Second reading.
" 26	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	Do.	9	Opening of Gladstone Library.
May 2	Books	National Liberal Club		
" 4	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	House of Commons	4	
" 4	Government Control of Railways	Do.	4	
" 9	Ireland	London		To Nonconformist Ministers.
" 14	Privilege	House of Commons	3	
" 14	Parliamentary Under-Secretary Bill	Do.	2	Condemns licensing clauses.
" 26	Local Government Bill	Hawarden		Deputation of Lancashire Liberals.
" 30	Political Situation	Do.		
June 11	Local Government Bill	House of Commons	2	
" 14	Wine Duty Bill	Do.	3	
" 15	Local Government Bill	Do.	3	
" 18	Death of German Emperor	Do.	3	
" 26	Criminal Law Act, 1887	Do.	25	Condemns administration of Irish criminal law.
" 27	Channel Tunnel	Do.	14	
" 28	Local Government Bill	Do.	2	
" 30	Ireland	Hampstead		
July 6	Payment of Members	House of Commons	5	
" 10	Business of the House	Do.	3	
" 18	Parnell Commission	London		To Liberal members for Northumberland and Cumberland.
" 20	Mr. Conynbeare and the Speaker.	House of Commons	4	
" 23	Charges against Members of Parliament	Do.	8	Parnell Commission.
" 30	Do.	Do.	6	Do.

	31	Do.	do.	Do.	Do.	3	Do.
" Aug.	1	Do.	do.	Do.	Do.	7	Do.
" "	2	Do.	do.	Do.	Do.	1	Do.
" "	20	<i>The Times</i>	.	.	Hawarden		To deputation of Liberals.
" "	23	Ireland	.	.	Do.		
Sept.	4	Cultivation of Fruit	.	.	Wrexham		
" "	4	Irish and Welsh Home Rule	.	.	Do.		At the Eisteddfod.
" Nov.	5	English Feeling towards Wales	.	.	Birmingham		
" "	5	Liberal Unionism	.	.	Do.		
" "	6	Labour Representation	.	.	Do.		National Liberal Federation.
" "	7	Payment of Members }	.	.	Do.		
" "	8	Irish Question	.	.	Do.		Do.
" "	19	Do.	.	.	Do.		
" "	23	Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill	.	.	House of Commons	29	
Dec.	3	Do.	.	.	Do.	3	
" "	4	Civil Service (Chief Secretary—Ireland)	.	.	Do.	17	Criticizes Mr. Balfour's administration of Ireland.
" "	15	Suakin	.	.	Do.	5	On the despatch of a British [battalion.
" "	17	Irish Question	.	.	Limehouse	10	
1889. Feb.	21	Civil Service—Foreign Embassies	.	.	House of Commons	9	
Mar.	1	Queen's Speech	.	.	Do.	27	On conciliatory measures in the government of Ireland.
" "	5	Do.	.	.	Do.	2	
" "	29	New Writ for Kennington	.	.	Do.	4	
April	4	On Death of John Bright	.	.	Do.	9	
" "	9	Naval Defence	.	.	Do.	10	
May	2	Home Rule for Scotland	.	.	Do.	4	
" "	6	Ways and Means	.	.	Do.	6	
" "	15	Police at Falcarragh	.	.	Do.	4	
" "	16	Intermediate Education (Wales) Bill	.	.	Do.	5	
" "	16	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	.	.	Do.	6	
" "	16	Perpetual Pensions	.	.	Do.		

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1889, May 17	Customs and Inland Revenue Bill	House of Commons	2	
" 27	Luggacurran Evictions	Do.	3	
" 28	Supply	Do.	9	
" 30	Local Government (Scotland) Bill	Do.	3	
June 5	Lessons of the Bye-elections	Southampton		
" 7	Lord Palmerston	Romsey		
" 8	Irish Question Shorter Parliaments }	Weymouth		
" 10	Irish Question	Torquay		
" 11	Do.	Falmouth		
" 11	Do.	Redruth		
" 12	Do.	Truro		
" 12	One man one vote	St. Austell		
" 12	Death Duties	Bodmin		
" 14	Dissentient Liberals	Launceston		
" 14	Home Rule	Plymouth		
" 17	Agricultural Labourers	Shaftesbury		
" 17	Do.	Gillingham		
July 2	Universities (Ireland) Bill	House of Commons	4	
" 4	Messages from the Queen	Do.	4	
" 5	Local Government (Scotland) Bill	Do.	3	
" 6	Irish Question Free Trade }	Cardiff		
" 9	Grants to Royal Family	House of Commons	3	
" 25	Do.	Do.	13	
Aug. 22	Cottage Gardens and Fruit Culture	Hawarden		
Sept. 7	Political Economy	Paris		
" 23	Dock Strike Bimetallism }	Hawarden		
				On presentation of freedom of Cardiff.
				At Paris Society of Political [Economy.

Dec.	2	Liberal Unionists } Foreign Policy	.	.	.	Manchester	National Liberal Federation.
"	3	Irish Question	.	.	.	Do.	
"	4	The City of Manchester	.	.	.	Do.	
1890. Jan.	9	Free Trade and Agriculture	.	.	.	Hawarden	
"	22	Irish Question	.	.	.	Chester	
Feb.	5	Homer and Assyrian Mythology	.	.	.	Oxford	Speech at the Oxford Union.
"	11	<i>The Times</i> and Mr. Parnell	.	.	.	House of Commons	
"	12	Queen's Speech	.	.	.	Do.	6
"	19	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	15
Mar.	3	Special Commission Report	.	.	.	Do.	9
"	3	Mr. Labouchere's Suspension	.	.	.	Do.	26
"	10	Special Commission Report	.	.	.	Do.	1
"	24	Land Purchase Bill	.	.	.	Do.	2
"	24	Special Commission Report	.	.	.	Do.	3
"	26	Medical Profession	.	.	.	London	At National Liberal Club.
"	31	Customs Department.	.	.	.	Do.	At Guy's Hospital.
April	24	Land Purchase Bill	.	.	.	House of Commons	
May	2	Disestablishment of the Church of Scotland.	.	.	.	Do.	3
"	12	Free Trade	.	.	.	London	16
"	15	Local Taxation Duties Bill	.	.	.	House of Commons	13
"	16	Parnell Commission	.	.	.		
"		Land Purchase	.	.	.	Norwich	
"	17	Licensing Question	.	.	.		
"		Siberian Atrocities	.	.	.	Lowestoft	
"		Agricultural Labourers }	.	.	.		
"	27	Political Situation	.	.	.	Harwarden	To deputation of Liberals.
"	28	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	Do.
"	29	Do.	.	.	.	Do.	Do.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1890. June 5	Channel Tunnel Bill . . . . .	House of Commons	8½	
" 9	Ireland . . . . .	Do.	7	On conduct of the police.
" 13	Local Taxation Duties Bill . . . . .	Do.	12	
" 16	do. . . . .	Do.	4	
" 18	Thrift . . . . .	London		To depositors in savings banks.
July 7	Civil Service Estimates . . . . .	House of Commons	5	Vote for Royal Irish Constabulary
" 17	Education of Women . . . . .	London		Speech at Burlington School.
" 24	Anglo-German Agreement Bill . . . . .	House of Commons	16	
" 30	Maltese Marriage Question. Ireland . . . . .	London		To Wesleyans at National Liberal
" 31	Sir G. Errington's Mission. . . . .	House of Commons	2	Reply to question. [Club.
Aug. 21	Cottage Gardening and Fruit Farming . . . . .	Hawarden		
Sept. 12	Industrial Progress . . . . .	Chester		At Dee Iron Works.
Oct. 21	Ireland . . . . .	Edinburgh		At Corn Exchange.
" 23	Do. . . . .	West Calder		
" 23	Condition of Working Classes . . . . .	Do.		
" 25	Ireland . . . . .	Dalkeith		
" 25	Home Rule for Scotland . . . . .	Do.		
" 27	Retention of Irish Members . . . . .	Edinburgh		
" 27	Procedure . . . . .	Do.		
" 29	Free Trade . . . . .	Dundee		
" 29	McKinley Tariff . . . . .	Do.		
" 29	Appreciation of Beauty . . . . .	Do.		
" 29	Licensing Question } . . . . .	Carlisle		
Nov. 6	Ireland . . . . .			
" 25	Debate on Address . . . . .	House of Commons	13	At opening of Victoria Art Gallery.
" 28	Business of the House . . . . .	Do.	3	
Dec. 2	Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill. . . . .	Do.	8	
" 5	Death of Mrs. Peel . . . . .	Do.	1	
" 5	Mr. De-mall and Home Rule . . . . .	Retford		

Feb.	4	Religious Disabilities Removal Bill	.	Do.	19	laugh resolution (1881). Moves second reading. At opening of Public Library, St. Martin's Lane. Adverse criticism of Irish execu- tive in Tipperary trials.
"	12	Free Libraries . . . . .	.	London		
"	16	Administration of Law (Ireland)	.	House of Commons	12	
"	27	Taxation of Land . . . . .	.	Do.	8	
Mar.	3	Parliamentary Franchise . . . . .	.	Do.	10	
"	13	Local Taxation . . . . .	.	Do.	—	
"	14	Homeric Artemis . . . . .	.	Eton College		
"	16	Business of the House . . . . .	.	House of Commons	4	
"	17	Mr. Goschen's Finance, Ireland	.	Hastings		
"	23	Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Bill.	.	House of Commons	—	
April	9	Do.	do.	Do.	—	
"	10	Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill.	.	Do.	6	
"	14	Do.	do.	Do.	2	
"	21	Do.	do.	Do.	1	
"	30	Business of the House . . . . .	.	Do.	3	
June	9	Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill.	.	Do.	1	
"	19	Colonial Episcopate . . . . .	.	London		Jubilee of Colonial Bishops Fund.
July	15	Fifty Years of Progress . . . . .	.	Hawarden		
Oct.	1	Study of Nature . . . . .	.	Glenalmond		Jubilee of Glenalmond College.
"	1	The Clerical profession . . . . .	.	Do.		
"	2	Liberal Programme . . . . .	.	Newcastle		National Liberal Federation.
Nov.	3	Free Trade and Local Self Government	.	Do.		
"	28	Home Rule . . . . .	.	Wirral		
"	28	Profit-sharing and co-operation . . . . .	.	Port Sunlight		
Dec.	11	Rural Reform . . . . .	.	London		Labourers' conference at Holborn Restaurant.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

## GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1892. Mar. 3	Business of the House	House of Commons	5	
" 3	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	14	
" 11	Supply	Do.	5	
" 16	Tenure of Land (Wales) Bill	Do.	10	
" 24	Small Agricultural Holdings Bill	Do.	9	
" 28	Indian Councils Act Amendment Bill.	Do.	9	
April 1	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	3	
" 4	Small Agricultural Holdings Bill	Do.	3	
" 7	Railway Servants (Hours of Labour)	Do.	6	
" 8	Small Agricultural Holdings Bill	Do.	10	Breach of privilege.
" 11	Ways and Means	Do.	4	
" 28	Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill	Do.	7	
" 29	Business of the House	Do.	3	
May 9	Small Agricultural Holdings Bill	Do.	2	
" 24	Local Government (Ireland) Bill	Do.	21	
" 26	Civil Service Estimates	Do.	2	
" 31	Government of London	Do.		
June 5	Home Rule for Scotland	London		London Liberal and Radical Union
" "	Disestablishment	Dalkeith		
" 16	Business of the House	Do.		
" 17	Adjournment	House of Commons	1	
" 18	Ulster and Home Rule	Do.	6	
" 29	Liberal Programme	Clapham Common		
" 30	Home Rule	Carlisle		
July 2	Do.	Edinburgh		
" 4	Labour	Glasgow		
" 5	Home Rule	Gorebridge		
" "	Disestablishment	Dalkeith		
" "	Government's Record	Corstorphine		
				Address to Nonconformists.

11	"	Conservative Record . . .	.	.	.	Penycuik		
Sept. 5	"	Archaic Greece . . .	.	.	.	London		
12	"	Welsh Affairs . . .	.	.	.	Carnarvon		
Oct. 21	"	Railway Enterprise . . .	.	.	.	Hawarden Bridge		
24	"	History of Universities . . .	.	.	.	Oxford		
Dec. 3	"	Liverpool and Manchester Ship Canal .	.	.	.	Liverpool		
1893. Jan. 31	"	Address . . .	.	.	.	House of Commons	11	
Feb. 2	"	Do. . .	.	.	.	Do.	1	
3	"	Home and Foreign Labour . . .	.	.	.	Do.	1	
3	"	Address . . .	.	.	.	Do.	10	
7	"	Business of the House . . .	.	.	.	Do.	2	
8	"	Address . . .	.	.	.	Do.	8	
9	"	Do. . .	.	.	.	Do.	2	
10	"	Do. . .	.	.	.	Do.	—	
11	"	Do. . .	.	.	.	Do.	8	
13	"	Government of Ireland Bill . . .	.	.	.	Do.	34	
14	"	Business of the House . . .	.	.	.	Do.	2	
23	"	Welsh Land Tenure . . .	.	.	.	Do.	—	
23	"	Irish members in the Imperial Parliament	.	.	.	Do.	—	
23	"	Progress of business . . .	.	.	.	Do.	1	
23	"	Established Church (Wales) Bill . . .	.	.	.	Do.	9	
27	"	Business of the House . . .	.	.	.	Do.	4	
28	"	International Monetary Conference	.	.	.	Do.	13	
Mar. 9	"	Business of the House . . .	.	.	.	Do.	2	
10	"	Sitting of the House (Saturday)	.	.	.	Do.	3	
10	"	Unofficial Members' Business . . .	.	.	.	Do.	7	
20	"	Uganda . . .	.	.	.	Do.	6	
22	"	Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill . . .	.	.	.	Do.	4	
27	"	Ireland—Conduct of the Executive . . .	.	.	.	Do.	10	
								At Congress of Orientalists.
								Cuts first sod of new railway.
								Romanes Lecture.
								Presentation with freedom of
								Liverpool.
								Replies to Mr. Balfour.
								On evacuation of Uganda.
								On suggested legislation for agri-
								cultural labourers.
								Introduces bill.
								Sir Gerald Portal's mission.
								On Mr. Balfour's motion of censure.

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1893. April 6	Government of Ireland Bill	House of Commons	23	Moves second reading.
" 21	do.	Do.	15	Reply to criticisms.
May 1	Egyptian Affairs	Do.	7	On second reading.
" 3	Mines (Eight Hours) Bill	Do.	7	
" 4	Shipping Federation	Do.	2	
" 8	Government of Ireland Bill	Do.	3	
" 11	do.	Do.	6	
" 23	Working Classes	Hawarden		Reply to Mr. Chamberlain.
" 29	Home Rule Bill	Chester		At opening of Hawarden Institute.
" 31	Government of Ireland Bill	House of Commons	9	Bill in Committee.
June 5	do.	Do.	2	Do.
" 7	do.	Do.	5	Do.
" 15	do.	Do.	3	Do.
" 16	Treaty of Arbitration with the United States	Do.	9	
" 19	Government of Ireland Bill	Do.	5	Do.
" 20	do.	Do.	6	Do.
" 22	do.	Do.	3	On Home Rule finance.
" 23	do.	Do.	2	Bill in Committee.
" 28	do.	Do.	2	Do.
" 29	do.	Do.	7	Moves resolution to close debate.
" 30	do.	Do.	4	
" 30	Indian Opium Revenue	Do.	10	
July 4	The Speaker and Mr. Conybeare.	Do.	2	
" 4	Government of Ireland Bill	Do.	3	Bill in Committee.
" 6	do.	Do.	—	
" 7	The Speaker and Mr. Conybeare.	Do.	3	Mr. Conybeare's letter to the <i>Daily Chronicle</i> .
" 10	Government of Ireland Bill	Do.	5	Bill in Committee.
" 11	do.	Do.	4	Do.

"	13	Do.	do.	.	Do.	5	Irish members at Westminster.
"	14	Marriage of Duke of York.	.	.	Do.	4	Bill in Committee.
"	18	Government of Ireland Bill	.	.	Do.	6	Moves address of congratulation.
"	25	do.	.	.	Do.	5	Bill in Committee.
"	26	do.	.	.	Do.	3	Do.
"	27	do.	.	.	Do.	5	Do.
"	31	Scene in the House—27 July, 1893	.	.	Do.	2	Do.
Aug.	5	Industry and Art	.	.	Agricultural Hall		
"	7	Scene in the House—27 July, 1893	.	.	House of Commons		
"	7	Government of Ireland Bill	.	.	Do.	—	
"	10	do.	.	.	Do.	6	
"	11	do.	.	.	Do.	5	
"	14	do.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	15	do.	.	.	Do.	7	
"	15	do.	.	.	Do.	8	
"	16	do.	.	.	Do.	—	
"	17	do.	.	.	Do.	6	
"	21	do.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	22	do.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	23	do.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	24	do.	.	.	Do.	4	
"	25	do.	.	.	Do.	3	
"	30	do.	.	.	Do.	17	Moves third reading.
Sept.	4	Business of the House	.	.	Do.	4	
"	27	Government of Ireland Bill	.	.	Edinburgh		
Nov.	9	Matabeleland	.	.	House of Commons	5	
Dec.	6	Local Government (England and Wales) Bill	.	.	Do.	3	On the House of Lords and the Home Rule Bill.
"	7	Do.	do.	.	Do.	6	
"	14	State of Public Business	.	.	Do.	4	

<sup>1</sup> The number of columns has been calculated to the nearest figure. No figures are given for speeches under a column in length.

Date.	Subject-matter.	Where delivered.	Columns in Hansard <sup>1</sup>	Remarks.
1893. Dec. 12	Privilege . . . . .	House of Commons	4	Question of privilege arising from a speech made by Mr. E. F. V. Knox, M.P.
" 19	Navy . . . . .	Do.	15	
" 21	Annuities of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha	Do.	5	
1894. Feb. 19	Local Government (England and Wales) Bill . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 20	Employers' Liability Bill . . . . .	Do.	7	
" 26	Local Government (England and Wales) Bill . . . . .	Do.	2	
Mar. 1	Do. . . . .	Do.	7	On House of Lords amendments. Last speech in the House of Commons.
May 3	Sir Andrew Clark . . . . .	London		
Aug. 14	Cottage Gardening . . . . .	Hawarden		
1895. Mar. 15	The English People . . . . .	Do.		Liberal deputation from Leeds and Huddersfield.
" 15	The Use of Libraries. . . . .	Do.		
Aug. 5	Small Holdings . . . . .	Do.		
" 6	Armenian Question . . . . .	Chester		
1896. Mar. 28	Railways . . . . .	Liverpool		
Aug. 3	Rural Life . . . . .	Hawarden		
Sept. 1	Music . . . . .	Do.		
" 24	Armenian Question . . . . .	Liverpool		
Oct. 16	Seaside Resorts . . . . .	Penmaenmawr		" His last great deliverance to a public audience." Morley's <i>Life</i> .
1897. May 4	Condition of the Clergy . . . . .	Hawarden		

## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

1827.

- "Eton Miscellany." Vol. I. By Bartholomew Bouverie, now of Eton College. June-July, 1827 . . . Eton; printed for T. Ingalton. Sold also by E. Williams, Eton; Knight & Brown, Windsor; R. S. Kirby, Paternoster Row; and W. Anderson, Waterloo Place. 8vo. pp. 246. Vol. II. October-November, 1827.

*The pseudonym "Bartholomew Bouverie" concealed the identity of William Ewart Gladstone.*

1838.

- "Speech delivered in the House of Commons on the Motion of Sir George Strickland, for the Abolition of the Negro Apprenticeship, Friday, March 30, 1838." With an appendix. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1838. 8vo.

- "State in its Relations with the Church." London: John Murray, 1838. 8vo.

1840.

- "Church Principles considered in their Results." London: John Murray, 1840. 8vo.

- "Canada Union Bill. Speech, May 29, 1840." London, 1840.

- "Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues." Speech, June 29, 1840. London, 1840.

1843.

- "Course of Commercial Policy at Home and Abroad." (Anonymous article.) *Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review*, January, 1843.

- "Der Staat in seinem Verhältniss zur Kirche, Nach der vierten Auflage des Originals eingeführt durch A. Tholuck." Uebersetzt von J. Treuberz. Halle, 1843. 8vo.

- "Present Aspect of the Church." *Foreign and Colonial Quarterly Review*, October, 1843.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, v. 1-80.*

- "Inaugural Address, delivered at the Opening of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool." London: John Murray, 1843. 8vo.

1844.

- Lord John Russell's translation of the Francesca da Rimini." *English Review*, April, 1844.

- "The Ministry and the Sugar Duties. Speech, June 3, 1844." London, 1844.

- "Speech . . . on the Second Reading of the Dissenters' Chapels Bills . . . 6th of June, 1844." London: B. Kinder, 1844. 8vo.

- "Ellen Middleton" (Review). *English Review*, July, 1844.

<sup>1</sup> The compiler of this bibliography wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to "Contributions to a Bibliography of the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone" which appeared in *Notes and Queries*, December 1892, and January 1893. The library catalogues at the British Museum, National Liberal Club, and St. Deiniol's, Hawarden, have also been consulted, and in addition access to Mr. Gladstone's manuscripts has been permitted by his trustees.

- "The Theses of Erasius and the Scottish Church Establishment." *New Quarterly Review*, October, 1844.  
Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."
- "The Ideal of a Christian Church." *Quarterly Review*, December, 1844.  
This review of the work by Rev. W. G. Ward is reprinted in "*Gleanings*," with passages restored which had been omitted by the editor of the "*Quarterly Review*."
- 1845.
- "Remarks upon Recent Commercial Legislation." London: John Murray, 1845. 8vo.
- "Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White." *Quarterly Review*, June, 1845.  
Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."
- "Substance of a Speech for the Second Reading of the Maynooth College Bill, 11 April, 1845." London: John Murray, 1845. 8vo.
- "Scotch Ecclesiastical Affairs." *Quarterly Review*, December, 1845.
- "A Manual of Prayers from the Liturgy. Arranged for Family Use." London: John Murray, 1845. 12mo.
- 1846.
- "Plain Facts relative to Corn Law Repeal." London: John Murray, 1846. 8vo.
- 1847.
- "From Oxford to Rome." *Quarterly Review*, June, 1847.
- "Lachmann's Ilias." *Quarterly Review*, September, 1847.
- 1848.
- "Duke of Argyll's *Presbytery Examined*." *Quarterly Review*, December, 1848.
- "Substance of a Speech on the Motion of Lord John Russell for a Committee of the whole House, with a View to the Removal of the remaining Jewish Disabilities, Dec. 16, 1847." With a preface. London: John Murray, 1848. 8vo.
- 1849.
- "Clergy Relief Bill." *Quarterly Review*, December, 1849.
- 1850.
- "Giacomo Leopardi." *Quarterly Review*, March, 1850.  
Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."
- "Speech on the Commission of Enquiry into the State of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge . . . July 18, 1850." Oxford, 1850. 8vo.
- "Remarks on the Royal Supremacy, as it is defined by Reason, History, and the Constitution." A letter to the . . . Bishop of London (Blomfield). London: John Murray, 1850. 8vo.
- "Substance of the Speech . . . on the Affairs of Greece, and the Foreign Policy of the Administration, 27th of June, 1850." London: John Murray, 1850. 8vo.
- 1851:
- "Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill. Speech . . . in the House of Commons . . . 25th March, 1851, on the Motion that the Bill be read a second time." London, 1851. 8vo.
- "A Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government." London: John Murray, 1851. 8vo.  
Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."
- "A Second Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen, on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government, etc." London: John Murray, 1851. 8vo.  
Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."

- "Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen, on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government." Third edition. London: John Murray, 1851. 8vo.
- "Lettere due . . . a Lord Aberdeen sui processi di stato del Regno di Napoli. Estratte dal Risorgimento." Torino, Ferrero e Franco, 1851. 16mo.
- "The Roman State, from 1815 to 1850." By Luigi Carlo Farini. Translated from the Italian by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone . . . Vols. I. and II. London: John Murray, 1851.
- 1852.
- "A Letter to . . . W. Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen . . . on the Functions of Laymen in the Church." London: John Murray, 1852. 8vo.
- This letter was written in December, 1851, and printed at the desire of the Scottish bishops in 1852. Reprinted in "Gleanings."*
- "Farini's Stato Romano." *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1852.
- Reprinted in "Gleanings."*
- "Speech . . . on the Second Reading of the New Zealand Constitution Bill, May 21, 1852." London, 1852. 8vo.
- "Count Montalembert on Catholic Interests in the Nineteenth Century." *Quarterly Review*, December, 1852.
- "An Examination of the Official Reply of the Neapolitan Government." London: John Murray, 1852. 8vo.
- Reprinted in "Gleanings."*
- 1853.
- "Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Financial State and Prospects of the Country . . . April 18, 1853." London, 1853. 8vo.
- 1854.
- "The Financial Budget for 1854." London, 1854. 8vo.
- 1855.
- "Speech on the War with Russia, May 24, 1855." London, 1855.
- "Sardinia and Rome." *Quarterly Review*, June, 1855.
- "Speech . . . on the War and the Negotiations, in the House of Commons, on the 3rd of August, 1855." Revised and corrected by himself. London, 1855. 8vo.
- "Our Colonies." An Address. London, 1855. 8vo.
- 1856.
- "The War and the Peace." *Gentleman's Magazine*, August, 1856.
- "The Declining Efficiency of Parliament." *Quarterly Review*, September, 1856.
- "The Place of Homer in Education." *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1856.
- Reprinted in "Studies in Homer and the Homeric Age."*
- 1857.
- "Homer and his Successors in Epic Poetry." *Quarterly Review*, January, 1857.
- "Prospects Political and Financial." *Quarterly Review*, January, 1857.
- "The Financial Statement, 1857. Speech in Committee of Supply, February 13, 1857." London, 1857.
- "War in China. Speech, March 3d, 1857." London, 1857.
- "The New Parliament and its Work." *Quarterly Review*, April, 1857.
- "The Bill for Divorce." *Quarterly Review*, July, 1857.
- Reprinted in "Gleanings."*
- "Homeric Characters in and out of Homer." *Quarterly Review*, July, 1857.

"Missionary Speech, Chester, Oct. 12, 1857." London: S.P.G. 12mo.

"On the Place of Homer in Classical Education and in Historical Inquiry."

*This article appears in "Oxford Essays, 1857," London, John W. Parker & Son.*

1858.

"France and the Late Ministry." *Quarterly Review*, April, 1858.

"Translation of Horace, Od. iii. 9, 'Donec gratus.'"

*Six verses in the "Quarterly Review," October, 1858, afterwards reprinted in "Translations" by Lord Lyttelton and the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone," 1861.*

"The Past and Present Administrations." *Quarterly Review*, October, 1858.

"Notice of the late Lord Braybrooke." *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1858.

"Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age." Oxford: University Press, M.DCCC.LVIII. 8vo. 3 vols.

1859.

"War in Italy." *Quarterly Review*, April, 1859.

"Tennyson's Poems." *Quarterly Review*, October, 1859.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, ii. 131-79.*

"Nelda, a Romance," translated from Grossi. *Fraser's Magazine*, December, 1859.

1860.

"Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Finance of the Year and the Treaty of Commerce with France. Delivered in the House of Commons . . . February 10th, 1860." London, 1860. 8vo.

"Inaugural Address delivered before the University of Edinburgh, April 16th, 1860." London, 1860. 8vo.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, vii. 1-29.*

1861.

"Letter to Governor and Deputy of Bank of England, 31 Jan., 1861, and Governor's reply." London, 1861. Another edition, 1863.

"Speech on the Second Reading of the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, May 16, 1861." London, 1861.

"Translations by Lord Lyttelton and the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone." London: Bernard Quaritch, 1861. 8vo.

1862.

"Financial Statement. Speech, April 3, 1862." London, 1862.

"Address and Speeches delivered in Manchester, April, 1862." Manchester, 1862.

*The address on the death of the Prince Consort delivered April 23, 1862, is reprinted in "Gleanings."*

"Mechanics Institutes: their Advantages and how to Improve them. A Lecture." Leeds, 1862.

1863.

"Wedgwood: an Address." London: John Murray, 1863. 8vo.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings."*

"Financial Statements of 1853, 1860-1863. To which is added a speech on Tax Bills, 1861." London, 1863.

1864.

"Financial Statement. Speech delivered April 7, 1864." London, 1864.

"Financial Statement of 1864. Delivered . . . April 7, 1864." London: John Murray, 1864. 8vo.

"Speech . . . on the Bill for the Extension of the Suffrage in Towns. May 11, 1864." London: John Murray, 1864. 12mo.

*Reprinted in "Speeches on Parliamentary Reform," 1866.*

1865.

"Financial Statement of 1865. Delivered . . . April 27, 1865." London : John Murray, 1865. 8vo.

"Address on the Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World ; delivered before the University of Edinburgh." London : John Murray, 1865.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings."*

"Speeches and Addresses delivered at the Election of 1865." London : John Murray, 1865. 8vo.

"Historical Remarks on the Royal Supremacy, Extracted from a Letter . . . to the . . . Bishop of London." London, 1865. 8vo.

*See "Remarks on the Royal Supremacy," 1850. The Extracts printed in 1865 were applicable to the Church at that date.*

"Correspondence between Captain R. Sprye and W. E. Gladstone on the Commercial Opening of the Shan States and Western Inland China by Railway direct from Rangoon." 1865.

1866.

"Speeches on Parliamentary Reform in 1866." With an appendix. London : John Murray, 1866. 8vo.

1867.

"The Session and its Sequel." *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1867.

1868.

"Phoenicia and Greece." *Quarterly Review*, January, 1868.

"Ecce Homo." *Good Words*, January, February and March, 1868.

*The first two articles are reprinted in "Gleanings."*

"Ecce Homo." London, 1868. 8vo.

*A reprint in volume form of the articles in "Good Words."*

"Speeches in South-West Lancashire, October, 1868." Liverpool, 1868.

"A Chapter of Autobiography." London : John Murray, 1868. 8vo.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings."*

"Correspondence between W. E. Gladstone and Mr. Rearden (London), 1868."

"Speeches delivered at Warrington, Ormskirk, Liverpool, Southport, Newton, and Lancashire, in October, 1868." London, 1868.

1869.

"The Irish Church. A Speech delivered in the House of Commons . . . March 1, 1869." London : John Murray, 1869. 8vo.

"Musæ Etonenses (Series Nova), 1869." Two Latin Poems, written at Eton and dated 1827.

"Juventus Mundi. The Gods and Men of the Heroic Age." London : Macmillan & Co., 1869. 8vo

1870.

"A Correct Report of the Speech . . . on Proposing the Irish Land Bill, February 15, 1870." London : John Murray, 1870. 8vo.

"A Speech delivered in the House of Commons on March 11, 1870, on the Second Reading of the Irish Land Bill." London : John Murray, 1870. 8vo.

"The Church in Wales. A Speech . . . in the House of Commons (May 24th, 1870), on the Resolution of . . . W. Williams." London : W. Poole. 8vo.

"Germany, France, and England." *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1870.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings." The footnote on p. 257 reads : "This article is the only one ever written by me, which was meant, for the time, to be in substance, as well as in form, anonymous. Motives of public*

*duty, which appeared to be of sufficient weight, both led to its composition, and also prohibited me from divulging the authorship.—W.E.G., 1878."*

1871.

"On an Infant who was Born, was Baptized, and Died on the same Day." *Good Words*, May, 1871.

*This poem is dated July, 1836.*

"A Corrected Report of the Speech . . . at Greenwich, October 28, 1871." London: John Murray, 1871.

1873.

"Speech on moving for Leave to bring in a Bill relating to University Education in Ireland (Feb. 13, 1873)." London: John Murray, 1873. 8vo.

"The Ministerial Explanation, House of Commons, 20 March, 1873." London, 1873.

"Letter on Evolution." *Contemporary Review*, December, 1873.

"Address delivered at the Distribution of Prizes in the Liverpool Collegiate Institution . . . With an introduction, etc." London: John Murray, 1873. 8vo.

*The address was delivered on December 21, 1872.*

"Speech . . . in the House of Commons, May 16, 1873, on Mr. Miall's Motion for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church." London: Church Defence Institution, 1873. 8vo.

1874.

"The Shield of Achilles." *Contemporary Review*, February, 1874.

"The Reply of Achilles to the Envoys of Agamemnon." *Contemporary Review*, May, 1874.

"Homer's Place in History." *Contemporary Review*, June, 1874.

"The Place of Homer in History and in Egyptian Chronology." *Contemporary Review*, July, 1874.

"Speech . . . on the Second Reading of the Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill, in the House of Commons, 6th July, 1874 . . . Revised by the author." Edinburgh, 1874. 8vo.

"Ritualism and Ritual." *Contemporary Review*, October, 1874.

"Life of Bishop Patteson." *Quarterly Review*, October, 1874.

*Review of Miss Yonge's "Life of John Coleridge Patteson." Reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, ii. 213-63.*

"Homer's Place in History." London, 1874. 8vo.

*Reprinted from the "Contemporary Review" for June, 1874.*

"The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance: a Political Expostulation." London: John Murray, 1874. 8vo.

1875.

"Life and Speeches of the Prince Consort. Court of Queen Victoria: *Contemporary Review*, June, 1875.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings" and in "Questions Constitutionnelles."*

"Speeches of Pope Pius IX." *Quarterly Review*, January, 1875.

"Is the Church of England worth Preserving?" *Contemporary Review*, July, 1875.

"Italy and her Church." *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1875.

*Reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, vi. 193-244.*

"Hymnus responsorius." *Contemporary Review*, December, 1875, pp. 160-2.

*A Latin translation, in seven stanzas, of "Art thou weary, art thou languid?"*

Introductory letter to M. de Laveleye's "Protestantism and Catholicism in their bearing upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations." 1875.

- "Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion. Three tracts. The Vatican Decrees.—Vaticanism.—Speeches of the Pope." Collected edition, with a preface. London: John Murray, 1875. 8vo.
- "Vaticanism: an Answer to Replies and Reproofs." London: John Murray, 1875. 8vo.
- "The Vatican Decrees." New York: Harper & Brothers, 1875.
- "Les décrets du Vatican considérés dans leur influence sur la loyauté civile . . . Traduit . . . par V. Oger." Bruxelles, 1875. 8vo.
- "Los decretos del Vaticano en relacion con los deberes civiles." Madrid, 1875. 8vo.
- "Dedfrydau Llys y Pab yn eu heffaith ar deyrngarwch gwladol: ymresymiad gwleidyddol . . . Wedi ei gyfieithu . . . gan R. J. Pryse." Wrexham. 8vo.
- "Faticaniaeth; atteb i geryddon ac attebion . . . Wedi ei gyfieithu . . . gan R. J. Pryse." Wrexham. 8vo.
- "I decreti del Vaticano, e i doveri del cittadino. Rimostranza politica. Il Vaticanismo. Risposta ai contraddittori della rimostranza . . . Traduzione di C. Guerrieri-Gonzaga." Firenze, 1875. 8vo.
- 1876.
- "Homerology: I. Apollo." *Contemporary Review*, March, 1876.
- "Homerology: II. Hippos, the Horse. III. Diphros, the Chariot." *Contemporary Review*, April, 1876.
- "Letter on Newman and Wesley." *Contemporary Review*, June, 1876.
- "The Courses of Religious Thought." *Contemporary Review*, June, 1876. Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."
- "Homerology: IV. Athenè. V. Aiolos." *Contemporary Review*, July, 1876.
- "Lord Macaulay." *Quarterly Review*, July, 1876. Reprinted in "*Gleanings*."
- "Memoir of Norman Macleod, D.D." *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1876. Reprinted in "*Gleanings*," 1879, *ii.* 343-63.
- "A Speech delivered at Blackheath . . . September 9th, 1876; together with letters, on the Question of the East." London: John Murray, 1876. 8vo.
- "Russian Policy and Deeds in Turkistan." *Contemporary Review*, November, 1876.
- "The Hellenic Factor in the Eastern Problem." *Contemporary Review*, December, 1876. Reprinted in "*Gleanings*," 1879, *iv.* 259-304.
- "Pavestolen og dens nyeste Færd. Tre Afhandlingene: Vatikan-Dekreterne; Vatikanisme; Taler af Pius IX . . . Samlet Udgave med en Fortale. Oversat efter det Engelske." Kjobenhavn, 1876. 8vo.
- "Rom und die neuesten Moden in der Religion." Nördlingen, 1876. 8vo. 3 parts.
- "The Church of England and Ritualism. Reprinted from the *Contemporary Review*, and revised. . . ." London: Strahan & Co., 1876. 8vo. Reprinted in "*Gleanings*," 1879, *vi.* 107-91.
- "A Biographical Sketch [of George William, fourth Lord Lyttelton.]" This short memoir appears in "*Brief Memorials of Lord Lyttelton*," Rivingtons, 1876.
- "Homeric Synchronism: an Enquiry into the Time and Place of Homer." London: Macmillan & Co., 1876. 8vo.
- ". . . Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East." London: John Murray, 1876. 8vo.

"De gruwelen in Bulgarije en het Oostersche vraagstuk . . . Uit het Engelsch door D. C. Nijhoff, met een voorwoord." Culemborg, 1876. 8vo.

("Bulgarian Horrors.") A translation into Russian, with Preface by K. L. Alexander. 1876. 8vo.

"De stroomingen van het godsdienstig denken. . . . Uit het Engelsch, met een inleiding door D. C. Nijhoff." Culemborg, 1876. 8vo.

1877.

"Life of the Prince Consort." *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1877.

"On the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion." *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1877.

Reprinted in "Gleanings."

"Montenegro. A Sketch." *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1877.

Reprinted in "Gleanings."

"Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions and Speech on the Eastern Question in the House of Commons, May 7, 1877." London: Eastern Question Association, 1877. 8vo.

"Piracy in Bornco and the Operations of July, 1849." *Contemporary Review*, July, 1877.

"Rejoinder on Authority in Matters of Opinion." *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1877.

Reprinted in *Gleanings*."

"Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East." *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1877.

Part of this article is reprinted in "Gleanings."

"The Colour-sense." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1877.

"The Dominions of Odysseus, and the Island Group of the Odyssey." *Macmillan's Magazine*, October, 1877.

"The County Franchise and Mr. Lowe thereon." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1877.

Reprinted in "Gleanings" and in "Questions Constitutionnelles."

"The Slavonic Provinces of the Ottoman Empire." Address at Hawarden. Published for the Eastern Question Association by Cassell, Petter & Galpin. London, 1877.

Preface to Miss Mackenzie's "Introductory Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey in Europe." 1877.

"Homer und sein Zeitalter. Eine Untersuchung über die Zeit und das Vaterland Homers . . . Autorisirte . . . deutsche Ausgabe von . . . B. Bendan." Jena, 1877. 8vo.

"Lessons in Massacre; or, The Conduct of the Turkish Government in and about Bulgaria since May, 1876, etc." London: John Murray, 1877. 8vo.

"The Royal Supremacy; as it is defined by Reason, History and the Constitution. Being the substance of a Letter . . . to the . . . Bishop of London . . . With a preface to the present edition by . . . W. E. G." London, 1877. 8vo.

1878.

"Last Words on the County Franchise." *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1878.

Reprinted in "Gleanings" and in "Questions Constitutionnelles."

"The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort." *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1878.

Reprinted in "Gleanings" and in "Questions Constitutionnelles."

"The Peace to Come." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1878.

- "The Paths of Honour and of Shame." *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1878.  
*Also published as a separate volume.*
- "The Iris of Homer : and her Relation to Genesis ix. 11-17." *Contemporary Review*, April, 1878.
- "Liberty in the East and West." *Nineteenth Century*, June, 1878.
- "A Modern 'Symposium.' Is the Popular Judgment in Politics more Just than that of the Higher Orders ?" *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1878.  
*The contribution by Mr. Gladstone is reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, i. 193-202, and in "Questions Constitutionnelles," 1880.*
- "Speech on Charity Voting Reform, July 11, 1878." London, 1878.
- "The Berlin Treaty and the Anglo-Turkish Convention. Speech in the House of Commons, July 30, 1878." London, 1878.
- "England's Mission." *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1878.
- "Kin beyond Sea." *North American Review*, September, 1878.  
*Reprinted in "Gleanings" and in "Questions Constitutionnelles."*
- "The Slicing of Hector." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1878.
- "The Sixteenth Century Arraigned before the Nineteenth. A study on the Reformation." *Contemporary Review*, October, 1878.  
*Reprinted in "Gleanings," 1879, iii. 217-73.*
- Preface to Dr. Schlieman's "Narrative of Discoveries at Mycenæ." 1878.
- "Mr. Gladstone at Rhyl. Speech on Foreign Policy of Government, Oct. 31, 1878."
- "Electoral Facts." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1878.
- "Homer . . ." London : Macmillan & Co., 1878. 12mo.
- "Der Farbensinn. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Farbenkenntniss des Homer . . . Autorisirte deutsche Uebersetzung." Breslau, 1878. 8vo.
- 1879.
- "The Friends and Foes of Russia." *Nineteenth Century*. January, 1879.
- "On Epithets of Movement in Homer." *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1879.
- "Probability as the Guide of Conduct." *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1879.  
*Reprinted in "Gleanings," under the title "The Law of Probable Evidence and its Relation to Conduct."*
- "Greece and the Treaty of Berlin." *Nineteenth Century*, June, 1879.
- "The Evangelical Movement, its Parentage, Progress, and Issue." *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1879.  
*Reprinted in "Gleanings."*
- "The Country and the Government." *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1879.
- "The Olympian System versus the Solar Theory." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1879.
- "The Speech . . . at Wellington College . . . November 3rd, 1879." Wellington College : G. Bishop, 1879. 8vo.
- "Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78 [*sic*]." London : John Murray, 1879. 8vo. 7 vols.
- "Dean Hook, an Address delivered at Hawarden." London : Bently & Son, 1879. 8vo.
- Κοσμον Νεότης, τουτεστιν οι θεοι και οι ανθρωποι της ήρωικης εποχης. Συγγραμμα εξελληνισθεν υπό Α.Μ. Ίδρωμενου. έν Κερκυρα, 1879, etc. 8vo.
- "Inaugural Address to the Students of the University of Glasgow . . . 1879." London : John Murray, 1879. 8vo.
- 1880.
- "The Approaching General Election. Speeches delivered in Midlothian, during . . . November, 1879." London : H. J. Infield, 1880. 8vo.
- "Free Trade, Railways, and the Growth of Commerce." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1880.

- "Russia and England." *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1880.
- "Political Speeches in Scotland, March and April, 1880." Second Series. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot, 1880. 8vo.
- "Political Speeches in Scotland, March and April, 1880. . . . With an appendix, containing addresses to the Midlothian electors, and a letter to Count Karolyi." Revised edition. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot, 1880. 8vo.
- "Religion, Achaian and Semitic." *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1880.
- "Conservative Collapse." (Anonymous article.) *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1880.
- "Political Speeches in Scotland, November and December, 1879. . . . With an appendix, containing the Rectorial address in Glasgow, and other non-political Speeches." Revised edition. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot, 1880. 8vo.
- "Questions constitutionnelles (1873-1878). Le trône et le Prince-époux. —Le cabinet et la constitution. Par W. E. Gladstone . . . Traduit de l'anglais et précédé d'une introduction par Albert Gigot . . ." Paris: Librairie Germer, Baillière et Cie . . . 1880. 8vo., and Table des matières.
- 1881.
- "The Irish Land Bill. Speech . . . April 7th, 1881." National Press Agency, London, 1881. 8vo.
- "The Irish Land Bill. (Second reading.) Speech . . . May 16th, 1881." National Press Agency, London, 1881. 8vo.
- "Speeches delivered . . . at Leeds, October 7th and 8th, 1881, on 1. Land and "Fair Trade."—2. Ireland.—3. Free Trade.—4. Foreign and Colonial Policy." 4 pts. National Press Agency, London, 1881. 8vo.
- 1883.
- "National Expenditure. Speech . . . in the House of Commons . . . 6th April, 1883." London: National Press Agency, 1883. 8vo.
- "Parliamentary Oaths. Speech . . . on the Second Reading of the Parliamentary Oaths Act Amendment Bill, 26th April, 1883." London: National Press Agency, 1883. 8vo.
- "Il discorso di W. E. Gladstone intorno a G. Garibaldi [2nd June, 1883]. Tradotto in Italiano da G. Zaffira." Londra: A. Andrews, 1883. 8vo.
- "Senti, senti, anima mia." *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1883.  
*A translation into Italian of Cowper's hymn "Hark, my soul! it is the Lord."*
- "The Conservative Legacy, 1880. Liberal Work, 1880-1883. Speech . . . at the Inaugural Banquet, National Liberal Club . . . 1883." London: National Liberal Club, 1883. 8vo.
- 1884.
- "Egypt and the Soudan. Speech delivered . . . in the House of Commons . . . 12 February, 1884." London: National Press Agency, 1884. 8vo.
- "The Franchise Bill. Speech delivered . . . in the House of Commons . . . 28th February, 1884." Authorized edition. National Press Agency, London, 1884. 8vo.
- "Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East." Article contributed . . . to the *Nineteenth Century* (August), 1877. With preface, etc. London: National Press Agency, 1884. 8vo.
- "Speech on Domestic and Foreign Affairs; delivered at West Calder, November 27, 1879." "Representative British Orations" with

notes by Charles Kendall Adams. New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1884. 16mo.

1885.

- "Soudan and Afghanistan. The Vote of Credit. Speech . . . in the House of Commons . . . April 27th, 1885." National Press Agency, London, 1885. 8vo.
- "Letter to R. Bosworth Smith on Disestablishment, Oct. 31, 1885."
- "Dawn of Creation and of Worship." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1885.
- "Address to the Electors of Midlothian, etc." National Press Agency, 1885. 8vo.

1886.

- "Mr. Gladstone's Midlothian Speeches . . . 1885." Reprinted from the *Daily Telegraph*. London : F. E. Longley, 1886. 8vo.
- "Prom to Genesis : a Plea for a Fair Trial." *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1886.
- "Speech delivered . . . on moving for Leave to introduce a Bill for the better Government of Ireland, on . . . 8th April, 1886." Authorized edition. London : National Press Agency, 1886. 8vo.
- "An Impeachment of English Rule in Ireland . . . Delivered in the House of Commons, April 8, 1886." A verbatim report—Speech on the Second Reading of the Home Rule Bill, Monday, June 7, 1886.
- "The Government of Ireland Bill. Reply delivered . . . in the House of Commons, closing the debate on . . . the Bill . . . on . . . 13th April, 1886." London : National Press Agency, 1886. 8vo.
- "Sale and Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill. Speech delivered in the House of Commons on . . . 16th April, 1886." London : National Press Agency, 1886. 8vo.
- "Home Rule Manifesto. Address . . . to the Electors of Midlothian, May 1st, 1886." London : National Press Agency, 1886. 8vo.
- "The Government of Ireland Bill. Speech delivered . . . on moving the Second Reading of the Bill . . . 10th May, 1886." Authorized edition. London : National Press Agency, 1886. 8vo.
- "Mr. Gladstone's great Speech on the Political Situation (in Ireland) in Edinburgh . . . June 18th, 1886." Manchester : A. Ireland & Co., 1886.
- "The Irish Question. I. History of an idea. II. Lessons of the election." London : John Murray, 1886. 8vo.
- "Speeches on the Irish Question in 1886. With an appendix containing the full text of the Government of Ireland and the Sale and Purchase of Land Bills of 1886." [Edited by P. W. C.] Revised edition. Edinburgh : A. Elliot, 1886. 8vo.

1887.

- "'Locksley Hall' and the Jubilee." *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1887.
- "Notes and Queries on the Irish Demand." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1887.
- Reprinted in "*Special Aspects of the Irish Question*."
- "The Greater Gods of Olympus : I. Poseidon." *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1887.
- "The Irish Question. Speech [at the Eighty Club Dinner] . . . on . . . April 19, 1887, and list of those present." London : Eighty Club, 1887. 8vo.
- "History of 1852-1860 and Greville's Latest Journals." *English Historical Review*, April, 1887.
- "The Greater Gods of Olympus : II. Apollo." *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1887.

- "Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century." *Nineteenth Century*, June, 1887.
- "The Great Olympian Sedition." *Contemporary Review*, June, 1887.
- "The Greater Gods of Olympos: III. Athenê." *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1887.
- "Mr. Lecky and Political Morality." *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1887.
- "Electoral Facts of 1887." *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1887.
- "Ingram's History of the Irish Union." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1887.  
*Reprinted in "Special Aspects of the Irish Question."*
- "Lessons of Irish History in the Eighteenth Century." In *Handbook of Home Rule*, 1887.
- "An Olive Branch from America." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1887.
- "Universitas Hominum, or Unity of History." *North American Review*, December, 1887.
- 1888.
- "A Reply to Dr. Ingram." *Westminster Review*, January, 1888.  
*Reprinted in "Special Aspects of the Irish Question."*
- "The Homeric Herê." *Contemporary Review*, February, 1888.
- "Coercion in Ireland. Speech . . . in the House of Commons, February 17th, 1888." Revised and authorized edition. London: National Press Agency, 1888. 8vo.
- "Further Notes and Queries on the Irish Demand." *Contemporary Review*, March, 1888.  
*Reprinted in "Special Aspects of the Irish Question."*
- "'Robert Elsmere' and the Battle of Belief." *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1888.
- "Channel Tunnel. Great speech . . . in the House of Commons on June 27th, 1888, as revised by Mr. Gladstone." (Preface by the Hon. F. Lawley.) London: C. F. Roworth, 1888. 8vo.
- "Reply to Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity." *North American Review*, May, 1888.
- "The Elizabethan Settlement of Religion." *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1888.
- "The Treatment of the Irish Members and the Irish Political Prisoners. A speech . . . at Hawarden Castle, August 20, 1888." London: Liberal Publication Department. 1888.
- "Mr. Forster and Ireland." *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1888.  
*Reprinted in "Special Aspects of the Irish Question."*
- "Queen Elizabeth and the Church of England." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1888.
- "The Future of English-Speaking Races." *Youth's Companion*, November, 1888.
- 1889.
- "Daniel O'Connell." *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1889.  
*Reprinted in "Special Aspects of the Irish Question."*
- "'Divorce'—a Novel." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1889.  
*A review of "Faithful and Unfaithful," by Margaret Lee.*
- "'For the Right.'" *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1889.  
*A review of Karl Emil Franzos's novel.*
- "Italy in 1888-89." *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1889.
- "Plain Speaking on the Irish Union." *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1889.  
*Reprinted in "Special Aspects of the Irish Question."*
- "Phœnician Affinities of Ithaca." *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1889.
- "Cottage Gardens and Fruit Culture. Address . . . at the Annual Exhibition . . . of the Hawarden and Buckley Horticultural Society,

- in the grounds of Hawarden Castle, on the 22nd of August, 1889." London: Cassell & Co. 8vo. Issued for the Cobden Club.
- "The Triple Alliance and Italy's Peace in it." By Ontidanos. *Contemporary Review*, September, 1889.
- "Journal de Marie Bashkirtseff." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1889.
- "The Workman and his Opportunities. A discourse delivered October 26th, 1889. Crystal Palace, London." London, 1889.
- "The English Church under Henry the Eighth." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1889.
- "The Question of Divorce." *North American Review*, November, 1889.
- "Memorials of a Southern Planter." *Nineteenth Century*, December, 1889. *Review of the work by Mrs. Smedes.*
- "Electoral Facts of To-day." *Nineteenth Century*, December, 1889.
- 1890.
- "A Defence of Free Trade." *North American Review*, January, 1890.
- "The Parnell Commission and the Vote of Censure upon Irish Members, 1890." Speech at the N.L.C. Liberal Publication Department, London, 1890.
- "Ellen Middleton." *Merry England*, January and February, 1890.
- A review of a new edition of Lady Georgiana Fullerton's novel, first issued in 1844, and reviewed at the time by Mr. Gladstone in the "English Review" (July, 1844).*
- "A Duel. Free Trade—the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Protection—the Hon. J. G. Blaine." *North American Review*, January, 1890.
- "The Melbourne Government: its Acts and Persons." *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1890.
- "British Poetry of the Nineteenth Century." *The Speaker*, January 11, 1890.
- "Dr. Döllinger." *The Speaker*, January 18, 1890.
- "On Books and the Housing of them." *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1890.
- "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture." *Good Words*, April, 1890.
- "The Creation Story." *Good Words*, May, 1890.
- "The Office and Work of the Old Testament in Outline." *Good Words*, June, 1890.
- "The Psalms." *Good Words*, July, 1890.
- "Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley." *Youth's Companion*, July 24, 1890.
- "Dr. Döllinger's Posthumous Remains." *Speaker*, August 30, 1890.
- "Mr. Carnegie's 'Gospel of Wealth': a Review and a Recommendation." *Nineteenth Century*, November, 1890.
- "The Mosaic Legislation." *Good Words*, September, 1890.
- "On the Recent Corroborations of Scripture from the Regions of History and Natural Science." *Good Words*, October, 1890.
- "Homer." Reprinted for private circulation from *Chamber's Encyclopædia*, new edition, 1890.
- "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture: VII. Conclusion." *Good Words*, November, 1890.
- "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture." Revised and enlarged from *Good Words*. London: W. Isbister, 1890. 8vo.
- "Landmarks of Homeric Study, together with an Essay on the Points of Contact between the Assyrian Tablets and the Homeric Text. London: Macmillan & Co., 1890. 8vo.
- 1891.
- "Professor Huxley and the Swine-miracle." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1891.

"Letter explaining a sentence in the article in the February number." *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1891.

"Memoir of John Murray." *Murray's Magazine*, May, 1891.

"Electoral Facts, No. III." *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1891.

"On the Ancient Beliefs in a Future State." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1891.

"The Speeches and Public Addresses of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. With notes and introductions. Edited by A. W. Hutton . . . and H. J. Cohen . . . With portraits. In ten volumes. . . . With a preface by Mr. Gladstone. London: Methuen & Co.

*Volumes IX. and X. appeared in 1891 and 1892 respectively. The rest of the work was never completed.*

1892.

"Olympian Religion." *North American Review*, February and May, 1892.

"The Platform, its Rise and Progress." *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1892.  
*A review of the book by Mr. Henry Jephson.*

"Did Dante study in Oxford?" *Nineteenth Century*, June, 1892.

"A Vindication of Home Rule. A reply to the Duke of Argyll." *North American Review*, October, 1892.

*An article by the Duke of Argyll had appeared in the August number of the "Review."*

"The Romanes Lecture, 1892. An academic sketch . . . Delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre, Oct. 24, 1892." With annotations by the author. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892. 8vo.

"Archaic Greece and the East." London: Luzac & Co., 1892. 8vo.

*Address to the Oriental Congress.*

"Female Suffrage. A letter . . . to Samuel Smith, M.P." London: J. Murray, 1892. 8vo.

"Special Aspects of the Irish Question. A series of reflections in and since 1886." Collected from various sources and reprinted. London: John Murray, 1892. 8vo.

1893.

"Some Eton Translations." *Contemporary Review*, June, 1893.

1894.

"Love Odes of Horace." Five specimens. *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1894.

"The Place of Heresy and Schism in the Modern Christian Church." *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1894.

"The True and False Conception of the Atonement." *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1894.

"The Odes of Horace, translated by W. E. Gladstone." John Murray, 1894. 8vo.

1895.

"The Lord's Day." *Church Monthly*, March and April, 1895.

"The Great Physician." Article on Sir Andrew Clark. *Youth's Companion*, June 27, 1895.

"Bishop Butler and his Censors." *Nineteenth Century*, November and December, 1895.

"The Psalter with a Concordance." John Murray, 1895.

"An Introduction to the People's Bible History." H. O. Shepard & Co., Chicago, 1895.

1896.

"The Future Life and the Condition of Man therein." *North American Review*, April, 1896.

"Sheridan." *Nineteenth Century*, June, 1896.

- "Massacres in Turkey." *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1896.
- "On the Condition of Man in a Future Life." H. Frowde, London, 1896.
- "Soliloquium and Postscript, a letter to the Archbishop of York." (In *Later Gleanings*.) 1896.
- "The Scriptures and Modern Criticism." In *People's Bible*, 1896.
- "Works of Bishop Butler." Oxford, 1896. 2 Vols. 8vo.
- "Studies subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler." Oxford, 1896. 8vo.
- 1897.
- "Later Gleanings : a new Series of Gleanings of Past Years. Theological and Ecclesiastical." J. Murray, 1897.
- "The Eastern Crisis. A letter to the Duke of Westminster." John Murray, 1897.
- 1898.
- "Personal Recollections of Arthur H. Hallam." *Daily Telegraph*, January 5, 1898.
- "On Books and the Housing of them." M. F. Mansfield, New York, 1898.



# GLADSTONE'S SPEECHES

## PART II

Selected Speeches

With Introductions by Herbert Paul



# SELECTED SPEECHES<sup>1</sup>

## LORD PALMERSTON'S FOREIGN POLICY

JUNE 27, 1850

In June, 1850, when Lord Palmerston was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a motion was carried in the House of Lords condemning his behaviour to the Greek Government because he had sent British ships of war to the Piræus as a protest against the refusal of Greece to compensate Don Pacifico, a Maltese Jew and a British subject, for losses suffered from a riot in Athens. By way of reply to this a resolution was moved by Mr. Roebuck, in the House of Commons, and carried by a substantial majority, which expressed general confidence in the foreign policy of Lord Palmerston and in the Administration of Lord John Russell. This was the first occasion upon which Mr. Gladstone appealed in Parliament not merely to the House of Commons, but also to a large and independent body of opinion outside. Palmerston had claimed that his policy enabled every British subject resident abroad to say *Civis Romanus sum*. Gladstone pointed out that that involved an assertion of superiority to all other nations, and argued that Palmerston habitually treated small States, such as Greece, with an arrogance which he did not display to the great Powers of Europe. The speech is in many respects a remarkable one, and deserves to be studied by every one who wishes to appreciate the principles held by Gladstone in respect to foreign affairs.

SIR, if I might presume to offer a general observation of the speech of the right hon. Baronet the Home Secretary,<sup>2</sup> who has just addressed the House, I should say that it consisted very much less of discussion upon the particular subjects on which the House will, at the close of the debate, have to deliver its solemn judgment, than of a somewhat vague enunciation of principles, clothed generally in an abstract form, most moderately and temperately expressed; and giving on the one hand very little occasion for dispute, but on the other, helping us as little towards arriving at a practical conclusion. None of us doubts that there are seasons when it is necessary to interfere

<sup>1</sup> The fourteen speeches which follow were chosen by Lord Morley as representative specimens of Mr. Gladstone's oratory.

<sup>2</sup> Sir George Grey.

in the concerns of other countries, or hesitates to profess in terms that the general rule should be to abstain from such interference. But these are mere generalities, and we must deal much more closely with the matter in hand if we desire to deal with it to advantage.

Sir, before I proceed to examine the merits of the question, I think it my duty to offer some remarks upon the position of the Government, and the constitutional doctrines which they have laid down in regard to it. A vote has been passed by another House of the Legislature, which directly impugns and ensures the policy of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for the Foreign Department,<sup>1</sup> with reference to his management of certain affairs in Greece. On the passing of that vote, the First Minister of the Crown makes no sign. When at length he is drawn forth from his silence by a question of the hon. and learned gentleman the Member for Sheffield,<sup>2</sup> then indeed he submits a statement to the House, and it is one which, in my view, calls for particular remark. "The Government," so said the noble Lord, "do not intend to alter their policy; they do not intend to resign their offices: they do not intend, with reference to the terms of the question put, to adopt any specific course whatever in regard to what has occurred. But at the same time," to this effect the noble Lord proceeded, "they do not dissemble that the vote of the House of Lords is an event of the gravest character; that it will have an influence on the conduct of foreign States; that it will impair the power which we ought to possess for the administration of the foreign affairs of this country." Sir, I for one must protest with all my might against the doctrine of the noble Lord. He is the First Minister of the Crown. He is the representative and the head of the great Whig party, with all its historical traditions; and he has come here to state that having been deprived by a vote passed in another place, of a portion of the power with which a Government requires to be armed in order to conduct the public affairs for the advantage of the State, he and his colleagues intend to continue to be the servants of the Crown, but do not intend themselves to take any step for the recovery of the power which they have lost.

But the noble Lord had a pair of precedents for his course, and very briefly may they be disposed of. First, he finds that in the year 1710, the House of Lords passed a resolution to the

<sup>1</sup> Lord Palmerston.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. J. A. Roebuck.

effect that England ought not to be a party to any arrangement which should leave both Spain and France in the possession of the House of Bourbon ; yet that this resolution was disregarded in the Peace of Utrecht. Is that a precedent at all ? The House of Lords has not now been passing resolutions upon hypothetical cases, about matters which have not occurred. When Parliament does any such thing, it does what may, indeed, under peculiar circumstances be justified ; but it steps beyond the discharge of its ordinary functions into a province not primarily its own. The House of Lords has not been attempting to fetter beforehand the free action of the Government by a premature judgment ; it has not been arrogating to itself any function of the Crown, to which is assigned by the constitution the office of considering and adjusting by negotiation the terms of treaties, subject of course to the responsibility of its advisers ; but that House, in the regular order, having taken into consideration the actual conduct of those advisers, as it appears in the papers presented by command of the Crown, has discharged a duty which constitutionally appertains to it in pronouncing a condemnation of that conduct.

And now what was the other precedent of the noble Lord ? It was the case of Portugal in 1833. In 1833 you had a vote passed by the House of Lords, which I will assume to be equivalent, for the purposes of the argument, to the recent vote respecting Greece. It was passed on the 3rd of June. On the 6th of June the same question was to be considered, at the instance of a supporter of the Government, in the House of Commons ; but so far were the Whigs of that day from thinking that the House of Lords had no concern in controlling the Executive, and that its vote might simply be overlooked, that Lord Ebrington rose in his place on the 4th of June, and thought it needful to take from the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs a specific assurance that the policy of the Administration would remain such as it had been until the House of Commons should (only two days later) have had an opportunity of giving its judgment upon the same question.

But what says the noble Lord now ? Various efforts were made to induce gentlemen, acting in opposition to the Government, to step in to their relief. The hon. and gallant Member for Middlesex<sup>1</sup> made an appeal to the hon. Baronet the Member for Radnorshire ;<sup>2</sup> but unhappily without effect. And then

<sup>1</sup> Mr. R. Bernal Osborne.

<sup>2</sup> Sir T. F. Lewis.

the noble Lord himself suggested to the hon. gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire,<sup>1</sup> that he might properly make a Motion on the subject. He, forsooth: and why was he to move? The purpose was, to reinstate the Government in its constitutional position, in the possession of the powers without which it ought not to be a Government. The purpose was, to question the vote of the House of Lords, and to neutralize and destroy its effect. Was this his affair? Sir, it is not for me to speak the sentiments of the hon. Member, but if on this occasion I may attempt to divine them, I really apprehend that he was not so ill satisfied with the vote of the House of Lords as to be desirous to disturb it; but you, who are dissatisfied with that vote, you who are the Ministers of the Crown, you who know that no Ministers should conduct the affairs of the country when stripped of the power which that vote has taken away from you,—it was for you, and not for him, to invite the judgment of this House in opposition to that decision in the House of Peers. However, you would not do so; and it was reserved to a gentleman wholly independent of the Administration, to the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield,<sup>2</sup> to make the attempt at extricating the Administration from its dilemma.

Well, Sir, the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield has interposed: and now let us mark the manner of his interposition. Has he proposed a vote contradictory to the vote of the House of Lords? Has he thought it prudent to raise the very same issue here that was raised there? No, Sir, he has shifted the issue; and no man shifts the issue, in the face of the enemy, without a motive. By so shifting it, he has given an indication of that which I plainly perceive, a very great unwillingness to meet the discussion upon the affairs of Greece. Is there any dispute about this unwillingness? Why then was it that, after the hon. and learned Member for Youghal<sup>3</sup> had given notice of an addition to the Motion, of such a nature that it would have directed the debate to the precise issue raised in the House of Lords, he was urged and induced by the noble Lord at the head of the Government to abandon his intention? And again; with what benevolent view did the Member for Montrose<sup>4</sup> conceive his Amendment? I invite the attention of the House to the words of that Amendment. The hon. gentleman the Member for Montrose proposed, and with perfect consistency

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. J. A. Roebuck.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. T. C. Anstey.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Joseph Hume.

and propriety as coming from him, words setting forth that "this House, taking into consideration the general policy of Her Majesty's Government, are of opinion that on the whole it is calculated to promote the best interests of the country." On the whole it is calculated. Those words "on the whole" are, I apprehend, without example in a vote of Parliamentary confidence. Let me venture to put a construction upon them. I construe the words of the hon. gentleman in this manner; that "on the whole" means "although I am not prepared to approve of the particular policy which the House of Lords has condemned." That was the meaning of the hon. gentleman; and he felt, and showed the feeling, that it would not be expedient to meet the discussion fairly, boldly, and simply, upon the affairs of Greece. And why was this? I am sorry to perceive that I give so much dissatisfaction to some gentlemen. The nature of the opinions I have to express forbids me to hope that it will be in my power to please them: but if my opinions themselves are such as can hardly fail to be unpalatable, I promise to do my best to avoid rendering them more so by the tone in which they will be expressed.

Sir, I think there was a very different reason for the shifting of the issue. I will not deny that it was a fair and legitimate reason, but I think it was one which ought to be placed distinctly before the House, so that no man shall mistake it or forget it. There was and is a feeling in this House that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has amongst us sources of peculiar weakness, and also sources of peculiar strength. As to weakness, there exists a sentiment even among some part of the political adherents of the Administration—I will not discuss or attempt to define the extent of it, but I merely allege that it exists—a sentiment to the effect that the noble Lord, notwithstanding his distinguished abilities, is not altogether as prudent as he is able in the management of the foreign affairs of this country. Understand, I beg, that I am not presuming to describe what are your general sentiments; but even among a portion of those gentlemen who sit opposite, there prevails an opinion, or a suspicion, that during the times when the administration of foreign affairs is in the hands of the noble Lord, the country is too commonly apt to be near the very verge of war. I admit, on the other hand, that the noble Lord possesses likewise in this House a source of strength that is peculiarly his own. There are in this House a class of gentlemen profess-

ing to hold what are termed strong liberal opinions, with whom the noble Lord is in the utmost favour, because they believe that he uses energetically the influence of this country for the propagation of those opinions among other nations of the world. It unfortunately happened, however, that in the case of Greece the noble Lord did not interfere on the side of liberty against despotism. The Government of that country is constitutional, and the interposition of the noble Lord has reference not to Greek affairs or institutions—at least on the surface it has no such reference, and we cannot tell what is beneath—but to certain real or presumed rights of British subjects resident in Greece. The case of Greece, therefore, so long as it stood alone, afforded no facilities for enlisting those sympathies of propagandism, to which I have referred, in favour of the noble Lord. On this account, I argue, it was judged wise to shift and to extend the issue ; to introduce other subject matter, and so to draw off attention in some degree from the specialities of the case of Greece, and to fall back upon the general good character which the noble Lord enjoys in that particular quarter of the House, on account of the belief that his main study is to promote the progress of popular opinions throughout Europe.

At any rate, Sir, it has now come to this, that we have before us two great divisions of the subject, each of them very distinct from the other ; each of them large enough to fill a separate debate, and the two very difficult to examine adequately together. We have, first, the cluster of questions relating to the policy of the noble Lord in Greek affairs—questions quite apart from the conflict between despotism and freedom, and from the principle of intervention considered at large. In the case of Greece, it is evident that the noble Lord could not accurately be described as having meddled in the affairs of a foreign State ; that is not the charge against him : he has, as matter of fact, been engaged—whether after a right or a wrong fashion it is for this House to determine—in giving what he calls protection to British subjects resident abroad. And there is no more important element in the whole range of the duties of a Foreign Minister, than rightly to bestow the care which is due to such persons. The first question raised for decision in the case of Greece is this—“ Upon what rules and principles is the Foreign Minister of this country to proceed in securing the interests of British subjects domiciled in foreign States ? ” The second question, also involving most important principles, is this—

“ In what manner is the observance of engagements to co-guaranteeing Powers to be secured ? ” And we have, thirdly, the important question, a question which, if it be in strictness one of fact rather than of principle, is nevertheless one of the very first rank and moment, whether the conduct of the noble Lord, in respect to France, has been of a character well calculated to preserve the friendly relations between England and that Power, which are so essential to the well-being of Europe. And all these points we have to consider in the case of Greece, quite apart from the yet larger question, whether England is or is not to preserve the general policy condemned with emphasis and with justice by Earl Grey in the passage so appositely cited by my right hon. friend the Member for Ripon.<sup>1</sup>

And now, Sir, to clear my way as I proceed, and with reference to various precedents which have been alleged in this debate, I disclaim and repudiate altogether the trial of our conduct in Greece by a comparison with what other countries may have done on other occasions. At all events, I say, if we are to be guided by precedents, do not let them be either exclusively or mainly precedents of that class which exhibit the conduct of powerful States towards feeble ones, because I will venture to affirm that that is not a creditable chapter in the history of Europe ; and any examples you may allege, drawn from that chapter, will do absolutely nothing towards securing in your favour the impartial judgment of posterity.

But I will say a word more particularly upon one precedent invoked by the right hon. Baronet,<sup>2</sup> who has just sat down, because it is taken from our own history. He cited the case of the sulphur claims urged by the British merchants in Sicily against the Sovereign of that country ; and he remarked that Lord Lyndhurst had urged the Government to exact reparation in the case of those claims, as if that were a reason why any sort of exaction might be made for any sort of claim. But what is the use of perplexing and entangling a matter of this kind by the allegation of pretended precedents that are in truth totally irrelevant ? The case of the sulphur claim was founded upon the construction of a treaty : that which Lord Lyndhurst did was, to assert what it appeared was the true construction of that treaty, and to require that effect should be given to it. That was a principle of unquestioned obligation ; whereas in the case of Greece, you have proceeded wholly on vague and

<sup>1</sup> Sir James Graham.

<sup>2</sup> Sir George Grey.

arbitrary notions of your own, with what bearing on treaties, and on the law of nations, I shall presently proceed to show.

Now, Sir, in coming to the consideration of the various claims against Greece, I must bear in mind how largely they have been discussed, both here and elsewhere ; and I shall therefore be studious to put aside, with a very few words, all those cases which are not essential to the main issue.

First, I shall put aside the case of the *Fantome*. I fully admit and assert, that it was the duty of the noble Lord to exact an apology in that case from the Government of Greece. But, on the other hand, I am convinced that we might have had that apology without resorting to reprisals, or to any employment of force. If you differ from me, I would observe that, before resorting to the use of force, it was the duty of the noble Lord to have put plainly and categorically his demand for such an apology ; but this he has never done. There is a strange and inexplicable gap in the correspondence, reaching from a date soon after the event to that very 16th of January, when this subject was summarily revived in the list of final demands upon Greece, to be satisfied within twenty-four hours. Even had he made such a demand, and had it been refused, surely, with respect to such a question, we might have been content to leave the vindication of our honour to the decision, by joint consent, of some friendly Power. My belief is, that it would not have been refused ; but at any rate it was not upon this that the employment of force ultimately turned : we never had asked in plain terms for an apology, and Greece never had in reply refused one.

I shall also pass by the cases of certain Ionians, which I know not how to designate ; perhaps they might properly be called the " twenty-pound cases." If I refrain from examining them in detail, it is only because the attention of Parliament has been largely exercised in this respect already, not because I think the proceedings in them have been defensible. On the contrary, I must not pass on without these general remarks. First, that the opinion of Baron Gros in these cases is evidently against you. In the case of the two Ionians at Patras he says, that " if he had to pronounce a judgment upon it "—that is, if he were arbiter—it would be " that that claim should not be prosecuted." The second of these two cases he manifestly considers ridiculous ; and of the case of the boats plundered at Salcina he says, that our claim is inadmissible. But we are

engaged, it seems, in protecting the interests of Ionian subjects. Well, if that is so, surely there is one body which beyond all others is entitled to be heard, and from which we may confidently expect approval and support. There is a Legislative Chamber in the Ionian Islands; and what language do they who represent in it the people of those islands hold with reference to our obliging care of their countrymen? I will not say that they go to the full length of making a positive complaint against the noble Lord. That indeed would have been rather a bold proceeding on their part. But they render you, as you shall see, little thanks indeed for mixing up Ionian claims in your controversy with Greece. I quote from the recent address presented by them to the High Commissioner of the Islands in answer to his speech. They state that "the Assembly cannot and ought not to pass over in silence the profound grief that the people of all the islands have felt at the differences which have occurred between Great Britain and the kingdom of Greece; and the more so, because among the grounds which have given occasion for those differences, it seems that the protection of Ionian interests is alleged." You can, I think, understand the meaning of that language. The Assembly ends with calling on the High Commissioner to give them official information on the subject.

Not wishing then, Sir, to detain the House with the examination of a mass of perplexed and contradictory details, I go to those larger cases which have occupied more of the public attention, and on which the main issue unquestionably depends.

I must allude, however, among these to the astonishing case of Stellio Sumachi, because there is no one affair of them all which more strikingly illustrates the noble Lord's method of procedure in this most important department of his duties; and I ask the House, I ask the Members of the Government themselves, whether they are prepared to justify the manner in which the noble Lord conducted his treatment of that case. Stellio Sumachi, a man of no known character, and under accusation of theft, makes a complaint that he has been subjected to cruel torture. I say he was under a charge of theft—not as if this circumstance disentitled him to protection, but because it was a reason for the exercise of caution in accepting his statements. This complaint is adopted by the British Consul at Patras, and transmitted to the British Minister at Athens, Sir E. Lyons; adopted by him, and transmitted to the noble Lord.

There is no sifting, no scrutiny, no resort to the tribunals in the first instance for redress. The appeal is at once made to the noble Lord ; and the noble Lord, on the mere receipt of that *ex-parte* statement, without raising a question as to the trustworthiness of the person, without any reserve for what may remain to be said on the other side, without any inquiry as to remedy before the judicial tribunals—and I will dispute and overthrow every word that the right hon. Baronet who preceded me, stated on the subject of recourse to the legal tribunals of the country—having received the first intimation of the case on the 21st of August, 1846, on the 24th returns that most extraordinary reply which I could wish to read at length if it were not midnight ; but I will simply recite the main allegations. He says that the British Government have learned with equal regret and surprise that this barbarous outrage and brutal torture have been inflicted by the Greek police ; they had hoped that such practices “ had ceased to disgrace the Executive Government of Greece ” ; they cannot permit such things to be done with impunity ; they demand that the police officers concerned shall be immediately dismissed ; that adequate pecuniary compensation be made to Stellio Sumachi ; and, lastly, that the compliance of the Greek Government with these “ just and moderate demands ” shall be reported to him by the next packet.

Now with regard to the matter of fact, whether this man was ever tortured or not, you may have formed a different opinion from that which Baron Gros formed ; yet it is due to the Greek Government that you should know what opinion was formed by Baron Gros upon the spot, with full means of information and in his impartial position. (*Cries of “ Oh, oh ! ”*) Yes, I say in his impartial position ; and let me tell you that, if you have a due regard for the estimation in which you are to be held by the world at large, you cannot pursue a more short-sighted policy than first of all to invite—no, not to invite, but to accept—the good offices of a friendly Power, than to admit that that Power has selected a well-qualified person to be its organ in rendering those good offices, and at last, when you find that his judgment is against you, to meet with a sneer, as is now done by the hon. and learned gentleman the Member for Southampton,<sup>1</sup> the acknowledgment of his impartiality. Hear then the judgment of Baron Gros. On the 5th of April,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. J. E. Cockburn.

1850, he writes to General La Hitte, that he cannot find any conclusive testimony as to the facts, and that in the doubt in which his inquiry leaves him, he would think it his duty to reject the claim. Now, as far as I am able to form a judgment, I think it probable that some personal injuries may have been unjustly and illegally inflicted on this individual. But that is not the question at issue, and has nothing to do with it. The question is this : do you recognize it as one of the principles of the foreign policy of Great Britain—"calculated," in the terms of the Motion, "to maintain the honour and dignity of this country," and "to preserve peace" with the nations of the world—that when an *ex-parte* complaint is made, proceeding from a man under accusation of theft, to the effect that he has been tortured contrary to law, you should, without examination as to the facts, and without inquiry as to the means of legal remedy, send to a Government allied with you, and protected by you, a peremptory demand for the dismissal of the officers charged, and the payment of compensation to the complainant, and for the announcement by the next packet that both have been done ?

Well, Sir, having, as I have shown, begun in violence, the noble Lord, strangely enough, shifted to the ground of reason. The correspondence went on, and an investigation took place. The noble Lord thought, and, as it appears to me, with some justice, that the investigation was insufficient : and at length he came to do what he should have done at first. Having, on August 24, 1846, written to demand the dismissal of public functionaries, and the payment of compensation before the next packet, five months later, that is to say, on the 30th of January, 1847, he writes to Sir Edmund Lyons to require that all the circumstances of Sumachi's treatment shall be openly and impartially investigated at Patras. Nothing could be more reasonable in itself, than such a request. But what I complain of is this, that the noble Lord, instead of writing to demand examination of the case in August, 1846, and then requiring redress, if the investigation had been frustrated, in January, 1847, should have written at the very first moment a letter implying a conclusive judgment on the case, and conveying that judgment in the most violent and offensive terms, and should have been obliged in the following January to write a fresh despatch, admitting by clear implication that he had as yet had no materials for forming such a judgment, and requiring

that such materials should be provided by a fresh examination.

And surely, Sir, it is by some notable and strange fatality that the noble Lord, when at length he has placed his case on a ground conformable to reason, cannot any longer keep up his interest in it, but must cease to act altogether. The agents of police, having been once criminally charged and acquitted, could not again be put upon their trial for the same offence; and after that announcement from the Greek Government, not another syllable appears in these papers with respect to Stellio Sumachi. My hon. and learned friend the Member for Oxford, to whom, and still more to my hon. and learned friend the Member for Abingdon,<sup>1</sup> we are much indebted for having applied their great acquirements and skill to the examination of these subjects, was most eloquent on the subject of the wrongs done to Stellio Sumachi. His feelings had been much harrowed by the account of these excruciating tortures, all of which he appeared implicitly to believe, and he argued with great earnestness that such a case afforded an ample justification for the strong measures adopted against the Greek Government and the people. My hon. and learned friend was evidently under the impression that redress had been demanded and obtained for Sumachi. No such thing, Sir. Why it was that his case did not appear along with others in the list presented in a peremptory manner last January I cannot tell, but certain it is, that if we are to rely upon the papers which have been presented to us, no demand was then made on behalf of that person; his wrongs, which, if true, are most serious, remain to this hour without redress: if he was tortured, he has not even twenty pounds' worth of consolation, nor have the police officers charged with maltreating him been dismissed. If, therefore, the noble Lord considered this to be the case of an injured British subject, he has altogether betrayed his duty by failing to afford him protection. For this man, upon whose chest we are told that heavy stones were placed, and that officers of police jumped upon them, and upon whom other horrors not fit to be mentioned were (as it is said) inflicted—for this man, in whose case the noble Lord first made a violent and preposterous demand that was met with contempt, and next a moderate demand that led to nothing—the noble Lord has neither gained nor sought compensation; and I tell my learned friend, who, I am sure, is as conscientious in his view of the case of Sumachi as he is known to be in all other

<sup>1</sup> Sir Frederick Thesiger.

matters, that, with his persuasion respecting the facts of it, he ought now to give his vote against the policy of the noble Lord for so gross a neglect and dereliction of his duty.

But, however, the case of Sumachi may illustrate the noble Lord's modes of proceeding, the measures ultimately adopted by him respecting Greece turn mainly on the cases of Mr. Finlay and M. Pacifico. I do not doubt that the House hears those names with alarm ; and although there are a multitude of details in both their cases, which are highly instructive, and which ought to be thoroughly known, yet, at this hour, and this stage of the debate, I shall endeavour to keep the attention of the House, so far as it depends upon me, fastened only upon the principle that is involved in those cases.

There is an original vice in the noble Lord's manner of proceeding, which is made perfectly evident in Mr. Finlay's case ; and I am not the less willing to attempt to exhibit it in that case, for the reason that Mr. Finlay is, as I believe, a man of undoubted respectability ; or, further, for the reason that, whether he was or was not determined to have the best possible price for his land—a matter into which I do not consider that we are entitled to examine—his claim was in substance a just one. And, moreover, I will admit that the proceedings of the Government of Greece in respect to it, considered in certain points of view, were vexatious, even if they were not shuffling. But the great question which I wish to ask, and which I now seek to test by means of these claims, is the question, upon what system and by what principle are the relations of British subjects, domiciled abroad, to the States in whose territories they are so domiciled, to be regulated ? Are they to be regulated by an exceptional system ? Are we to place them upon a ground that the subjects of other States are not allowed by the rules of international intercourse to occupy ; or are they to be governed by the laws of the several countries within which they may reside ?—always, of course, with the reserve of diplomatic intervention in case those laws should palpably fail to secure for them results conformable to general justice. Now, Sir, no words that I can use could exaggerate, or even adequately express, the immense importance of this question. The subject, indeed, of the restraints of international law may not at this moment be palatable to gentlemen whom I see sitting yonder (*on the lower Ministerial benches*) ; it may not easily harmonize with their sense of their mission to propagate liberal opinions

through the world ; but it is nevertheless essential, now that this question has been raised, that it should be thoroughly investigated ; it is vital to every other country in which British subjects reside ; it is vital to the British subjects thus residing abroad, that the whole world should know upon what terms they are henceforward to afford the rites of hospitable reception to such persons, and what price is to be paid for the benefits that their residence confers.

Now, Sir, as to the general principle which governs this question, there can in terms be little dispute. I have here the citations from Vattel, who is perfectly clear upon it ; but I need not trouble the House with them, because I can appeal to an authority nearer hand. I may, indeed, in passing, direct attention to the strange assertion of the hon. Member for Cambridge. The hon. gentleman has actually laid down this general proposition—that the subjects of any given country, resident in any other country, have an absolute right to the enjoyment there of at least as good laws as those by which they would have been governed at home. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, has made up his mind to this conclusion after much consideration and a due inquiry into the principles of international law and their bearings on the case. Still I think it will be found that he will have the exclusive enjoyment of such an opinion. I pass on, therefore, to the doctrine of the noble Lord the Secretary of State, which is of a very different order. He used the following words to describe the proper form of remedy for injuries suffered by such persons :—" Where the law is applicable, British subjects are bound to have recourse for redress to the means which the law of the land affords them. That is the opinion which our legal advisers have given in innumerable cases." He went on to explain that there were also cases in which there could be no legal remedy and where another remedy should consequently be sought. I am sufficiently well pleased with the noble Lord's principle ; and I shall take the liberty of testing his practice by it. So also my hon. and learned friend the Member for Oxford<sup>1</sup> laid down the true principle with admirable clearness—I mean, as to the principle of law ruling the case, for I fear that I shall have to impugn his knowledge of the facts. I understand him to say, that if the law be found palpably deficient, a British subject may seek another remedy ; but that he can have no other remedy whatever until he has

<sup>1</sup> Sir R. H. Inglis.

exhausted all the means which the law affords him. That subject, of remedies over and above the laws of the country in which as a foreigner you reside, is one of the utmost delicacy ; but I need not discuss it here. I contend, that in the cases before us, Mr. Finlay and M. Pacifico did not exhaust, nor try to exhaust, the remedies which the law of Greece supplied. My hon. and learned friend says, his general rule is not applicable to Mr. Finlay's case : while he was eloquent upon the necessity of our making ourselves acquainted with the papers by a careful perusal, he too plainly showed that his various avocations had not left him time for such a perusal. For my hon. and learned friend actually assured the House that the Greek law was not applicable to the case of Mr. Finlay, and that the Government of Greece itself did not refer him to the tribunals. Now, Sir, on the contrary, there is not, I think, a single letter from the Greek Government in regard to Mr. Finlay's case, where they do not distinctly and pointedly intimate that the tribunals were open to him, and that to them he should have repaired. I will not trouble the House with reading the passages ; but, in order that there may be no mistake, you shall have that which is the material point, namely, the references to them in the books which many Members have at hand. The first is at page 16 of the February Papers, dated February 19, 1846. The second at page 23, date November 4, 1846. The third at page 5 of the additional papers on this case, date August 30, 1848. And the fourth at page 40 of the February Papers, date November 21, 1848. In every one of these places, the Greek Government pointed out, in language which I defy my learned friend to mistake, that Mr. Finlay's proper recourse would have been to the tribunals. And so it would ; for the Greek law, as I am informed, permits a private person to sue the sovereign : I believe through the medium of one of his officers. But did Mr. Finlay have recourse to the tribunals ? ("Hear, hear!") I understand your ironical cheers. You mean to say, "It was very well for the Government of Greece to refer him to the courts of law ; but we do not believe he could really have gone there." Then I will show you that Mr. Finlay himself admitted that he might have gone there. ("No, no!") If you deny it, I am afraid I must read from Mr. Finlay's own letter for the purpose : and you will see that he advances special reasons, not why he could not, but only why he should not, go before the tribunals. (An HON. MEMBER : "Hear, hear!") Is the hon.

and learned gentleman, who was loud in expressing his dissent when I asserted that the tribunals were legally competent to try the case, is he now going to ride off upon the feeble and evasive pleas, that, although they may have been competent in point of jurisdiction, yet there were other reasons which rendered it inexpedient that Mr. Finlay should go before them ? With those other reasons I will deal presently ; but in the meantime I say, that whatever they may have been, if the tribunals were competent by law to try the case, then at all events, in order even to give you the basis of an ulterior claim in any other form, Mr. Finlay was absolutely bound to go before them. If the tribunals were open, and if Mr. Finlay would not plead before them, the case of the noble Lord against the Greek Government, so far as that gentleman is concerned, is unsound from the very bottom. If the tribunals were corrupt, it was his duty to go before them, and then to allege and show their corruption ; if they were feeble to show their weakness : if their jurisdiction would only cover part of his case, it was his duty to apply to them for that part, and then, in claiming diplomatic intervention, to show in what point they had fallen short. There may be, and no doubt there are, inconveniences and disadvantages in the operation of this principle ; but it is the principle of the law of nations ; and it is the only principle on which you can conduct with honour or with safety your charge over British subjects dispersed through all the States of the civilized world.

In his letter, dated September 4, 1848, Mr. Finlay says—

“ And with reference to my now carrying my claim before the Greek tribunals, M. Colocotroni is aware that any action I can bring must pass over the arbitrary seizure of my property.”

One word upon the fact of the arbitrary seizure. I may admit it for argument's sake ; but it is far from being clear, as it appears that Mr. Finlay, on behalf of himself and others, signed a petition of inhabitants of Athens to the King of Greece, offering to cede to him their lands at the very low price of twenty leptas a pic : a price much lower than the inadequate price afterwards offered by the Government. If I admit the arbitrary seizure, I am admitting what Baron Gros declined to admit. Now, the arbitrary seizure is assigned by Mr. Finlay as his first reason for not going before the tribunals. The noble Lord the Foreign Secretary had stated, and in my opinion justly stated, that Mr. Finlay was entitled to compensation, first of all for the value of his land, according to what it was worth at the time when

it was taken ; secondly, to something by way of addition, in consideration of its having been taken from him without his consent. Now, I say, that if the tribunals were competent to award to him the value of his land, as I conceive that he admits, but not competent to make any compensation for the compulsory purchase of it, it was his duty to go into the courts, to obtain from them the value of the land ; and then, if he thought fit, to invoke diplomatic aid for the purpose of obtaining for him anything beyond, which law might be unable to give him, but to which he might plainly be entitled in point of justice.

The second reason which Mr. Finlay assigns is this—

“ M. Colocotroni knows that the expense and delay attendant on bringing a case before the courts of law between a foreigner and the Crown for damages, when the wrong was inflicted prior to the Revolution of 1843, is tantamount to a denial of justice for the present.”

Sir, for my part I was not aware that any legal question, especially any one pertaining to the possession of land, could be tried without some kind of expense and delay, and more especially I have never been fortunate enough to hear of any delay in a matter of law, which did not amount to a denial of justice to the suffering party for the time while it continued. What, however, I wish the House to observe is, that the second reason alleged by Mr. Finlay himself for not going before the courts, proves, like the first, that he might have gone before them if he had thought fit.

And now we come to the third reason, Mr. Finlay's only ultimate reason, as he himself intimates, for not applying to the Greek tribunals. He says—

“ I cannot equitably be called on to sue the Greek Government in its own courts, so long as it retains the power of changing the judges from day to day, a power which the Government of Greece has often used in a suspicious manner, as, I think, you are well aware.”

If, Sir, we are to say that on account of the circumstances that the Greek judges hold office during pleasure it was warrantable for Mr. Finlay to decline the jurisdiction of the courts in which they sit, let us at least consider, before we accept that doctrine, how far it will carry us. I ask to be informed how many countries there are on the Continent of Europe in which the judges do not hold office during pleasure ? We ourselves enjoy, in the United Kingdom, the advantage of a bench of Judges independent of the Executive Government ; an advantage which was the rather later result of experience and advancement

in the practice of constitutional government. I am informed that in France a portion of the Judges, but a portion only, hold their offices during good behaviour. I wish to know from Her Majesty's Ministers in what other country of Europe that state of things does not prevail, which it seems is, wherever it prevails, to justify our departure from the general principle of international law, as in Greece? But why do I speak of other countries? I look to the Empire of Great Britain: at this moment the head of the judicial body in England, and in Ireland, the Lord Chancellor, holds office during pleasure. Would you permit a foreigner to demur to his jurisdiction upon such a plea? What, again, are foreigners to do in the Colonies of this Empire? Throughout their vast extent I suspect that, unless it be Canada, you will find scarcely a single exception to the rule that the judges hold office during pleasure. They are liable to be dismissed, often by the petty head of a small community, and subject to no other review than by an office of State sitting in Downing Street, at a distance of five or ten or fifteen thousand miles. And what should we say, if a foreigner domiciled in the Colonies were to refer to the diplomatic agent of his country for the prosecution of his legal rights, on the ground alleged by Mr. Finlay, that the judges are not appointed for life?

I conclude that this House will not be of opinion that there is to be one rule for the weak and another for the strong, and that, because Greece is a kingdom of small extent and resources, therefore we are to establish for resident Englishmen immunities as against her, which we should not claim from Russia or from Austria, or from France, and which we never should concede, as against ourselves, to any Power upon earth.

And if this be so, then, after what has been stated, I fearlessly assert you cannot excuse your not having required a recourse to the courts of law before using force, in the case of Mr. Finlay, by the particular tenure of the judicial office as it exists in Greece.

But there may remain another plea. You may be inclined to say that the tribunals of Greece are practically so corrupt that these cases could not with propriety be taken before them. I reply, it is too late to put that plea; you have entirely precluded yourselves from employing it. My chief witness and authority is the Eleventh Article of the Treaty which you have concluded with Greece. Now recollect, I pray you, what is the position of the noble Lord. He has to prove that he is entitled

to take the causes of British subjects domiciled in Greece out of the cognizance of the ordinary tribunals, to pass by those tribunals altogether, and to prosecute those causes by means of diplomatic intervention. But let us turn to the terms of this treaty, which define in a mode the most specific and distinct the footing on which the subjects of each country are to be placed, when residing in the other, with respect to the redress of private wrongs. The article runs as follows—

“ Throughout the whole extent of the territories of each contracting party, the subjects of both shall enjoy full and entire protection for their persons and property. They shall have free and easy access to the courts of justice in the presentation and defence of their rights, and shall be at liberty to employ the lawyers, attorneys, or agents, of whatever denomination, whom they may deem the best qualified to maintain and defend their interests.”

And now I beg the particular attention of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the succeeding words ; because they appear to me to have been most unhappily absent from his recollection during these proceedings—

“ It being understood that they shall conform in this respect to the obligations imposed upon native subjects by the laws of the country. In all that concerns the administration of justice, they shall enjoy the same privileges, rights and franchises that belong to natives.”

Is it then in the case of Greece that we shall arrogate an arbitrary power to pass by and ignore the courts of law, to be our own witnesses and our own judges and jury, to decide our cause and assess our own damages, and to enforce what we may choose to call our grievances by the use of military means, after we have thus solemnly bound ourselves in the face of Europe and the world by the clear declarations of a treaty, that our subjects in Greece shall stand, with respect to all matters touching the administration of the law, and touching the tribunals, in the same position, with the same rights, as natives of the country ? I seriously put it to the House, that the noble Lord, by the course he has thought fit to pursue, has not only violated the general law of nations, but has infringed the particular obligations of a treaty with Greece. And yet that treaty is a treaty of the year 1837, and the name which is attached to it on the part of England is no other than that of “ Palmerston.”

But again, what do others say, what does Mr. Finlay himself say, respecting the Greek tribunals ? And here I pause for a moment to remark, that I am a little surprised at the extreme severity with which the institutions of the kingdom of

Greece are criticized in this House. I should have hoped to find here some stronger sense of the difficulties which beset the way of a State struggling towards the enjoyment of freedom, something more approaching to sympathy with the people of Greece. Nor can I think the more highly of the political wisdom of a noble Lord opposite, the Member for Aylesbury, because he smiles with some derision when I refer to those institutions.

But if you tell me that bribery is used to facilitate the movement of the wheels of State in Greece, where there is a representative constitution not yet seven years old, I must ask you how long it is since this House of Commons was tainted by bribery, and whether more than two or at the utmost three generations have elapsed since the wholesale employment of it was almost a recognized element in the government of the country?

But, Sir, though the tribunals of Greece, like those of many continental countries, may not be altogether free from stain, yet it is a gross error to suppose that they are radically corrupt; and it is right that she should have the benefit of the testimony which has been borne in their favour by no less a person than Mr. Finlay himself; in words, let me add, which seem to me to do him the utmost honour for his manly avowal. He says, in the letter from which I have been quoting—

“It is true that the Greek tribunals have so nobly defended the liberty of the Press and the rights of the Greeks on many occasions against the Courts and the Government, that I should feel great confidence in their equity in any case that could come fairly under their cognizance, if the judges were named for life.”

(“Hear, hear!”) What! are you by those cheers again attempting to recur to a position you have been obliged to abandon? It has been shown before, that you cannot with decency, to say nothing of justice, enforce your claims by extralegal means against Greece on the ground that the judges are not named for life, unless you were prepared to enforce a similar law against powerful States, and to address to them the same imperious language: “We refuse the jurisdiction of your courts, and will proceed through the medium of diplomacy, directly backed by the strength of our armaments, in every case where our subjects have a claim in law or equity to adjust.” And it has now been shown out of the mouth of Mr. Finlay, that neither can you take your stand upon the plea that the tribunals of the country are unworthy of confidence from their corruption.

But you shall have yet other evidences, the evidence of Sir Edmund Lyons himself, who, in his despatch of the 24th of February, 1836, writes thus to the noble Lord: "The Press is unshackled: the tribunals are completely independent."

I am assured, by what I consider excellent authority, that we underrate the civilization of Greece, so far as that depends (and it must greatly depend) upon the regular and professional study of law. There is, I believe, a flourishing law school in the University of Athens: there is a regular system of judicature, a regular course of appeal through three courts; and the highest of these, the Arcopagus, is one of which the judicial sentences have never been tainted by the breath of hostile accusation. If such be the tribunals of Greece, how far are they from showing that entire and palpable inability to do justice, which it would be absolutely essential for the vindication of the noble Lord to prove.

But there is another point of great importance with respect to Mr. Finlay, on which I must beg you to give me an answer. In October, 1849, arbitrators were appointed by mutual consent to settle the claim of Mr. Finlay. Why had not that arbitration been concluded before January? And why in January was it not allowed to proceed? You will tell me, perhaps, that it could not proceed in January because the law of Greece only allows a period of three months for arbitrations, and that period had expired. But, Sir, I am informed by a gentleman of high respectability, holding a professorship in the University of Athens, that, although the fact does not appear in these papers, the Greek Government had offered, before the demand of Mr. Wyse, to waive its privilege of cutting off the arbitration, and to concede another term of three months for it. If this is not true, let it be contradicted. If it is true, as I believe, you had not the shadow of a right to resort to reprisals in order to enforce Mr. Finlay's claim. But again I ask emphatically, why was it that the arbitration had not before the month of January reached its close? On this point I complain very much of the indistinctness of the papers before us. I think Mr. Wyse says the want of progress was chiefly owing to the Greek Government; yet Mr. Finlay appears to me not to commit himself fully to that allegation. But however that may be, I beg the House to observe that Baron Gros, who is a man of character, and has acted as the representative of France, and whose word, I presume, will hardly be disputed on a matter of fact, states

most distinctly that the reason why the arbitration has made no progress was this : that Mr. Finlay, who was the complaining party, and whose duty it was to make his case before the arbitrators, did not produce the necessary documents and proofs of his claim. The words of Baron Gros are to this effect—

“ The act naming the arbiters was signed before a notary on the 6th of October, 1849. . . . However, no step onward has been taken. Mr. Finlay did not put the arbitrating tribunal in possession of information on the affair it is to decide, and all remains in *statu quo*.”

Do not therefore allege that it was the Greek Government which threw impediments in the way of the arbitration ; for Baron Gros, representing what I shall presume to call the impartial agency of France in their affairs, distinctly affirms it was owing to Mr. Finlay. Upon the cause I scarcely venture to speculate ; yet, considering in retrospect all that has occurred, it is difficult to help supposing that Mr. Finlay had, in the autumn, some glimpse of the likelihood that a British armament might shortly appear near the Piræus, and that more favourable terms might be obtained for his land by negotiation under the guns of that armament, than by the more usual method that had been agreed on ; and that in consequence he was not over-anxious to press matters to a conclusion before the arbitrators.

I come, however, now to the much more serious and much worse case of M. Pacifico. I shall again endeavour to avoid the vast masses of detail which this case comprises, because I hold that it must stand or fall by the principles applicable to the case of Mr. Finlay. Had you the power of repairing to the courts of law for the reparation of the injury which he had suffered ? If you had, did you avail yourself of that power ? Otherwise you had yourselves alone, in the main point, to blame, and had no right to employ diplomatic agency for an end which *non constat* but that the regular course of law could have attained.

M. Pacifico's principal claims were two. The first was for the sacking and plunder of his house : and that there may be no question as to my view of such proceedings, I at once declare that a detestable and execrable outrage was committed upon him. Any attempt to palliate that outrage I cannot make. Further, I freely and entirely admit to you that the character of M. Pacifico does not matter to us one straw when we are considering his title to protection or to compensation, and that we must proceed to vindicate it in precisely the same manner,

whether he be the best man or the worst man in the world. But at the same time I differ altogether from those who say that we have nothing to do with his character in this matter as it stands. I wish with all my heart that I could have avoided it; I do not find it a very agreeable subject to rake into.

Then there is again the point of his religion. We are told by the supporters of the Motion, that M. Pacifico is reviled, and injustice done him, because he is a Jew: but I do not hear any of its opponents found themselves on his religion as a reason either for oppressing him or for mistrusting him. I say fearlessly, whatever may be the differences of opinion in this House as to the admission of Jews to political privilege, that no person could dare to stand up among us and allege his religion as a ground for mistrust or for the denial of justice, without drawing down upon himself, from all quarters of the House alike, universal scorn and indignation. But M. Pacifico himself has compelled us to consider rather narrowly the question of his character, because the whole of these enormous claims on his behalf—claims amounting to something like £30,000 or £31,000 out of a total of £32,000 or £33,000—the whole of the allegations respecting them—which are of a nature, as I think, to strain to the uttermost the credulity of any man living—rest altogether on his personal credit. There may be one or two exceptions to such a remark, but they are so trivial and insignificant as to be little worth even this passing notice. It is not, with these trivial exceptions, upon the faith of documents, not upon the faith of independent testimony, but upon this person's individual word, that Sir Edmund Lyons accepted—as in every case indeed he accepted from others, and in my judgment deserves the serious disapprobation of this House for having so accepted—the allegations, wholesale as they were made, and transmitted them without distinction or inquiry to the noble Lord; upon which the noble Lord, adopting them in the same inconsiderate and partial spirit, endeavoured to force them wholesale on the Government of Greece, so that in effect the unsupported allegation of M. David Pacifico has been the prime and main mover of the operations of the British fleet against Greece.

Well then, Sir, we are bound to examine into the value of these allegations, as they are connected with the character of the party. And, first, I think it my duty to remark, that ten days ago a statement was made in terms the most distinct,

before a full and distinguished concourse, and with the utmost notoriety, to the effect that a certain David Pacifico, of the same domicile, creed, and nation, with our David Pacifico, did forge a bill for £600; and the identity of the party was at least suggested. Was not that statement, thus openly made, susceptible of contradiction? ("Oh, oh!") Do those gentlemen who cry "Oh!" mean to express their horror at the forgery of the bill—in which case I will cry "Oh!" along with them—or at the notice taken of it, in which case I cannot? Sir, I say it is a legitimate, and not only a legitimate, but a necessary matter for notice. I say this statement is a presumption, and, not having been denied, has become a strong presumption, though I do not say, even now, it is a demonstration, against M. Pacifico; and I say further, this is no question of holding a man innocent until he is found guilty—the people of Greece have been found guilty and mulcted on M. Pacifico's allegation, and he has received some hundred and forty thousand drachmas of their money, than which I take leave to say a greater iniquity has rarely been transacted under the face of the sun. If a man against whom there are *prima facie* reasons for questioning his credit, comes before the Government of a State, and founds upon that credit enormous demands, to be enforced by military means against a friendly nation, I say it is your duty to dispose of those presumptions against him before you proceed to act upon his uncorroborated allegations. This charge then, it seems, has not been denied; and if there was power to deny it, the fact that it has not been denied appears quite inexplicable.

But, Sir, without resorting to a single hostile testimony, the very papers presented to us on behalf of M. Pacifico contain in my judgment too many presumptions of the same kind. And though his being a Jew is not a reason for debarring him from any of his just rights, yet neither is it a reason for exempting him from inquiry to which other persons would be subjected, irrespectively of their creed, under similar circumstances. Now, I ask the question whether any one man in this House has read the celebrated inventory of M. Pacifico's furniture and effects, without finding that it bears on the very face of it all the proofs of gross, palpable, and wilful exaggeration? It is declared by Baron Gros, in language by no means too strong, to be a "deplorable exaggeration." It recites the great value of the articles of his furniture; and then the learned Member for Bath

thinks that he has solved the difficulty by telling us that he has been to some upholsterer in London who said he could easily make a couch worth £170, or even more. This is rare simplicity. Yes! no doubt many a London upholsterer could make a couch worth £170, and could get him a chest of drawers worth £53, a carpet worth £60, a card-table worth £24, two mirrors worth £120, and a bed worth £150, and so forth: no doubt he could also purchase at shops in London of another class a china dinner-service worth £170, and two tea and coffee services worth £64. All these could be bought in London: you may find such articles in shops, and you may find some of them in private mansions, but then they are found inside the houses of men who outside those houses have £20,000, £50,000 or £100,000 of income by the year. Then again you find recited as having been in the house of M. Pacifico all these articles and many more besides of the same high relative values, and the very first thing which must occur to a reader of the catalogue, and strike him as utterly marvellous, is, that he had not only the finest furniture and finest clothes in his house, but had no other kind of clothes or furniture. There was not an ordinary article of either from the top to the bottom of his house. Everything in it was a specimen of the richest and the rarest of its kind. When I first heard this statement made in another place, I confess I thought it must have been a figure of rhetorical licence; and the House cannot now learn with more surprise than I did when I examined the document for myself, that the whole appliances and appointments of the mansion of Pacifico were characterized by this astonishing luxury. And yet this man, who thus surpassed nearly all subjects and equalled almost any prince, according to his own account, in many articles of luxury, who has £5,000 worth of clothes, jewels and furniture in his house, had not outside of it, except plate pledged to the Bank of Athens for £30, which he had not been able to redeem, one single farthing! The subject of M. Pacifico's claims may be a tedious one to the House, it has been so frequently under their notice; but I venture to express the opinion that the details of them, as they are contained in these volumes, would really afford no bad material for some ingenious writer of romance.

So, Sir, having his house crammed full of fine furniture, fine clothes, and fine jewels, M. Pacifico was in all other respects a pauper: but this is not all; it is plain that his furniture as he has described it, was massive and solid in the highest degree.

And yet we are told of its disappearing, its being broken to pieces and destroyed. It is not pretended that fire was used, but that a mob came into his house, and in an hour and a half, or, according to other places of the book, in three hours, destroyed these solid masses of mahogany. Why, Sir, they could not without fire thus have destroyed such articles, unless indeed they had eaten them. Sir, the whole statement bears on the very face of it outrageous fraud and falsehood. A man with this large mass of property in his house, carries on the trade of a money-lender upon a borrowed capital of £30, and when his furniture is destroyed declares that he has not an *obolus* wherewith to buy his bread. No such case ever existed.

But, besides allegations, there is, as I have said, some small documentary evidence produced by M. Pacifico. Let us use this evidence to test his character. The documents to which I shall refer are two. Never, until long after the fact—after you had used force against Greece—after Baron Gros had arrived at Athens—but then, at length, in order to overcome the incredulity of Baron Gros, M. Pacifico was desirous to produce evidence as to the value of his furniture. Well, Sir, he produces, for one, a certain Signor Giacomo Capriles—evidently a man of high dignity, for, as he says of himself, “the Chevalier” (Pacifico) “had selected him to conduct his correspondence as his secretary, especially with the Minister at Lisbon”; that is to say, Sir, in plain, but, I trust, not profane language Signor Giacomo Capriles was a consul’s clerk. But Signor Giacomo Capriles set forth, that while he moved in this sphere of dignity, he enjoyed opportunities of “becoming acquainted with the noble and splendid mode of life practised in the house” of M. Pacifico. You will, therefore, observe that this evidence bears out M. Pacifico’s own representations. Before he was ruined by the Athenian mob, he was, by his own witness’s testimony, practising a noble and splendid mode of life. Now, I turn to the second document; and I must observe, that the Chevalier Pacifico has done wisely and well to eschew the production of much documentary evidence, and to trust to copious assertion; for even in the few documents he has ventured to produce there is self-contradiction. At the time when the fleet of Sir William Parker commenced its operations against Greece, you had had but one real document before you—for I cannot dignify with that name certain copies of letters certified, as Baron Gros says, only by M. Pacifico himself—and this was a notarial protest

which he had lodged in Athens against the Portuguese Government on the 4th of January, 1845, for not paying him £26,000. Now, in this document he himself speaks of his own condition and circumstances at the time to which the evidence of Capriles, cited already, referred; and what he says is this—by withholding payment of these claims “the Portuguese Government have left me in indigence in a foreign land!” So much for his veracity—for the trustworthiness of the man, upon whose unsupported allegations you have proceeded to violence against the Greek Government and people, and into whose character on that account, I say, it was both my right and my duty—and a nauseous and revolting duty it has been—to examine.

Well then, Sir, having this monstrous and wilful exaggeration in his hands, did M. Pacifico, or did he not, go before the tribunals, and exhaust the remedies afforded by the law, before betaking him to diplomatic aid? Sir, upon this point my hon. and learned friend the Member for Oxford,<sup>1</sup> I must take leave to say, fell into serious error, for he entirely overlooked the distinction between the criminal justice of the country, which punishes offenders, and its civil justice, which gives redress to those who have suffered by the offence. M. Pacifico has indeed taken in some of us by his allegation that he went before the tribunals. It is true that he went on the day of the riot, to the Procureur du Roi, and moved him to institute an inquiry; but the inquiry had reference exclusively to a criminal prosecution, which had nothing whatever to do with civil redress. Had this prosecution been pushed with the utmost vigilance and rigour, and every one of those rascals who sacked his house been well punished, as they deserved to be, for the outrage they had committed, that would not have mended M. Pacifico's furniture, nor relieved his beggary. He called in the Procureur du Roi just as in this country he might have called in the officer of police; but the officer of police could have done nothing towards replenishing his empty purse. But why did these criminal proceedings fail? It is alleged by M. Pacifico that the Greek authorities were unwilling to pursue the inquiry; and, I confess, I think it would have been more to their honour if they had prosecuted it with more vigour, notwithstanding the apprehensions which they might have entertained of any fresh outbreak of popular fanaticism. But, on the other hand, I find no evidence that M. Pacifico himself gave them the aid which he

<sup>1</sup> Sir R. H. Inglis.

might have afforded. The main question, however, is, could he, and did he, betake himself to the courts of law for civil redress? Of those who attacked his house in a tumultuous assemblage, each one, I apprehend, was fully liable for the acts of the body. Now, Sir, I challenge contradiction, when I say that M. Pacifico took no step whatever to obtain civil redress. He gives his pretended reasons—he states that he saw a great number of persons, some of them soldiers of the gendarmerie; some of them belonging to families of wealth and station, particularly the sons of a Minister of State, who, as the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary tells us, were not children, but young men of eighteen or twenty; but a portion of them, as he alleges, were so poor that it would have been useless to proceed against them with a view to obtaining damages, and the rest were so rich and powerful that it would have been hopeless to expect a decision against them from the courts. But he does not deny that it was in his power to institute a suit against these rich persons, whom he alleges that he saw, before the tribunals. Why did he not do it? If he was poor and despised and a Jew, would he have had no aid from the British Embassy? Could not the purse of this country have been freely opened if necessary, and the weight and influence of this country have been freely used in his behalf in the path and by the methods of law, to obtain for a man who had suffered under an execrable outrage some reasonable redress? No, Sir, there was a foregone determination not to call in the aid of the regular tribunals of the country. It was too notorious that all such complaints as these, be they what they might, and proceed they from whomsoever they might, were received without any scrutiny, as they arose, by the British Minister, transmitted by him bodily as they stood to the noble Lord, accepted in like manner by the noble Lord, and then returned in the form of official complaints and demands against the Government of Greece.

And I must beg the House to hear what were the sentiments—I think, in the main, the just and reasonable sentiments—of the Government of Greece, with respect not merely to the detail, but to the principles of this case; for it is true that they objected in principle, not to the claim for redress, but to the lodgment of that claim against the State in the first instance. M. Colocotroni wrote in these terms on the 28th of July, 1848, to Sir Edmund Lyons—

“ You perceive, M. le Chevalier, that I do not enter upon the merits

of the case ; it would not be competent for me to do so. That which one of my predecessors has maintained, that which I also think, is, that in order to give compensation, it is necessary that there should first be a sentence of court ; then, that the decisions of the judicial authority should not in their execution have been sufficiently supported by the competent authority ; and that the injured party should have no other resource save the interference of his representative, in order to obtain what a sentence had awarded to him. Diplomatic interference would in that case be well founded and expressly authorized by the law of nations. Let M. Pacífico then fulfil these indispensable formalities ; let him do what he ought to do ; and then he may be sure that his complaints will be listened to, and that the King's Government will interpose no delay in granting him, from the proper quarter, the compensation which may be due to him."

But steadily, and from the first, M. Pacífico eluded going before the tribunals, where his allegations would have been sifted and his fraud exposed ; and he was abetted in this mode of proceeding by the British Minister. On the 4th of April this outrage happened ; on the 7th M. Pacífico invoked the aid of Sir Edmund Lyons ; it will hardly be contended that within those three days he had tried what the law could do for him, and had found it fail. One last authority I will quote to you, to prove that the Greek Government were right, and that he ought to have gone into the courts of law ; a high authority ; the authority of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. On the 12th of October, 1847, M. Pacífico produced a story of another outrage, all appearance twin brother to the first. Having said this, I need not give the details. It was received, adopted, and transmitted, by Sir E. Lyons, in his invariable manner, without scrutiny or question. But when it came to the hands of the noble Lord, he returned this, as I think, most proper and reasonable reply ; it is dated December 18, 1847—

" I have to instruct you to cause a prosecution to be instituted against the offenders, in the name of M. Pacífico, but at the expense of Her Majesty's Government."

That letter, when received at Athens, instead of being obeyed, was simply referred to M. Pacífico. In this case, as you see, which, trumpery as it was, had the respect of exact resemblance to that of April 4, the British Minister was ordered, on his own responsibility, to institute the suit, to choose the counsel, and to back, of course if necessary, with the dignity of his position, an effort to obtain justice in the regular course. But M. Pacífico was not to be seduced ; he well knew where his best market lay. He wrote to the British Minister to say there was not one, no, not one member of the Greek bar who would dare to take up

the cause for the poor despised Pacifico. This is strange enough : it is yet more strange that Sir Edmund Lyons actually returned this false and irrelevant plea of M. Pacifico as his sole answer to the positive orders of the Secretary of State ; it is most strange of all, that the Secretary of State, upon receiving this most irregular and improper answer, acquiesced in it, and from that day to this we hear no more of resorting to the Greek tribunals.

Now, Sir, I simply allege, quoting the authority of the noble Lord, as shown in his directions with regard to the mock affair of the 12th of October, that the same course ought to have been enjoined and enforced with regard to the real affair of the 4th of April ; and I add, that if, in conducting the foreign policy of this country, we are to pay no regard to the laws and the tribunals of other nations, we have no title to expect that they shall pay any regard to ours.

Sir, as to the second main claim of M. Pacifico, that in respect of certain documents which, as he asserted, proved his demand upon Portugal, I cordially subscribe to the language of Baron Gros on the 19th of last March ; it is not even of a nature to bear discussion. It is a claim for no less than £26,000, alleged to have been due for a great number of years, for some twenty years, more or less ; with respect to which, as Baron Gros observes, this British subject has never once invoked the aid of the British Ambassador at Lisbon. We are told, indeed, that with a singular irregularity he had once asked Sir Edmund Lyons to write to Sir William Parker about these claims : Sir Edmund Lyons did it : but Sir William Parker, then in the Tagus, knew his duty better, and replied (we are told) that the time was not convenient for naming them. The noble Lord, indeed, on receiving the account of this monstrous demand, of which Sir Edmund Lyons, in his usual fashion, said, " I have every reason to believe that M. Pacifico's claim is just and proper," was a little staggered, and gently suggested that the claimant ought to produce some documents or testimony, or, at all events, to make a clear statement of particulars ; but he remains contented with the trumpery reply, that the documents had been scattered by the war in Portugal, or destroyed in the pillage of his house. But Baron Gros makes this observation, and I submit that it is quite unanswerable—

" Since M. Pacifico protests, in 1845, against the Portuguese Government, that it has not yielded to his reasonable demands, there must

necessarily exist in the archives of the Office of Foreign Affairs, or in that of the Finance at Lisbon, a demand for liquidation transmitted thither by M. Pacifico, and by consequence an authentic copy of the documents which served to establish his right, and to make good the value of his claims."

But yet, Sir, notwithstanding not only the absence of positive proof, but every presumption of falsehood and imposture, these enormous demands have been adopted by the Government of Great Britain, the naval power of Great Britain has been put in action to enforce them, and they have been urged, too, upon Greece in their entirety. (VISCOUNT PALMERSTON expressed his dissent.) Yes, Sir, in their entirety. The noble Lord tells Sir Edmund Lyons, on the 2nd of February, 1848, that he had judged rightly in making a general demand for the whole upon the Greek Government, leaving it to the Greek Government to disprove any portion of it if they could. The noble Lord may shake his head; but that motion, however potent, will not remove written words from off the pages of the volumes that he has laid before us. These claims, I repeat, were urged without abatement by Mr. Wyse in his peremptory demand of January 16, and these were enforced by the action of the fleet. I do not say that a readiness to reduce them has not been declared at a later date; but I quote the very words used by Mr. Wyse so lately as the 8th of March, 1850, nearly two months after the use of force, when he relates his first interview with Baron Gros, and says of all the claims in common—

"I begged it to be distinctly understood, that I had no instruction to go into any discussion as to the nature or amount of these claims, or any authority to make any concessions or modifications."

And now I think the noble Lord will not shake his head again, when I affirm before this House, that this huge imposture was adopted in the mass; that it was placed as it stood before the Greek Government among those demands which they were required to satisfy within twenty-four hours; that it constituted of itself something like five-sixths of the entire demand upon Greece: and when I support this assertion by a reference to the amount of seizures made by the fleet, because, while the whole of the other claims did not reach more than some £6,000 or £7,000, the value of all the seizures made, as far as it can be estimated by an average founded on the valuation of those at Corfu, was for the forty-one vessels, without reckoning cargoes, about £82,000.

Sir, I assure the House that I turn from this subject with a relief and satisfaction as great as theirs.

I have thought it right in a case of this serious nature to make the charge against the noble Lord as clear, definite, and circumstantial as possible. I do not wish to insinuate anything ; my desire is only to meet the noble Lord in open warfare ; and if we, who are now in conflict with him, were capable of entertaining any different wish, I must say that the manner in which the noble Lord himself has fought his battle in this House, would have set us the example of the spirit and the temper in which we should proceed. I therefore thus sum up my complaints of the noble Lord in terms the most explicit ; I affirm, first—and this I have illustrated particularly by the case of Stellio Sumachi—that your demands, even if they had been just, were urged in a tone and manner wholly unjustifiable. I affirm, secondly, that you urged as just, and that upon a State both feeble in itself, and specially entitled to your regard as one of its protecting Powers, demands which bore upon the very face of them the abundant proofs of fraud, falsehood, and absurdity. I affirm, lastly, that instead of trusting and trying the tribunals of the country, and employing diplomatic agency simply as a supplemental resource, you have interposed at once in the cases of Mr. Finlay and M. Pacifico the authority of foreign power, in contravention both of the particular stipulations of the treaty in force between this country and Greece, and of the general principles of the law of nations ; and have thus set the mischievous example of abandoning the methods of law and order in order to repair to those of force.

Sir, there is another wholly distinct question, with respect to the little islands of Cervi and Sapienza, which must not be passed by. It involves a matter of the highest importance, namely, the principles on which we are to proceed towards co-guaranteeing Powers in subjects falling within the scope of the guarantee.

Sir, I complain that there has been unbounded mystification in regard to Cervi and Sapienza. We claim them on the part of the Ionian Islands. Greece claims them as a portion of her territory, of which the integrity was guaranteed by England, France, and Russia jointly. We are not able to deny that the question of dominion over these islands is a territorial question to be settled by the three Powers, and ought not to be touched by any one of them before the others have heard of it. There

is great debate upon the question whether the claim to these islands was one of those included within Mr. Wyse's note of the 16th of January. M. Londos asserted that it was so included : and, from evidence not contained in these papers, I think it possible that he may be right ; but I pass that by. Mr. Wyse treats the assertion of M. Londos as a gross misrepresentation. He says everywhere that the case of Cervi and Sapienza was one entirely separate ; and, in all the correspondence with Russia and with France on this subject, they are given to understand, or left to infer, that we had done no act which was at variance with their rights as co-guaranteeing Powers. But why all this debate about the note of the 16th of January ? Suppose we are right in our doctrine about that note, what will the House of Commons think when they are told that these papers contain anterior and conclusive evidences of the wrong done by the noble Lord ? The letter of orders to Sir William Parker, indeed, as my right hon. friend the Member for Ripon<sup>1</sup> observed, does not appear—I know not why—in these papers ; but you will find in them a letter written by order of Earl Grey, from Mr. Elliot to Mr. Addington, as follows—

“ Sir,—I am directed by Earl Grey to acknowledge your letters of the 12th and 27th ultimo, containing further intelligence respecting Cervi and Sapienza ; and I am to acquaint you that in accordance with the suggestion of Viscount Palmerston, instructions have been given to the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands to adopt the necessary measures, in concert with the Admiral, as soon as he can conveniently detach a portion of his force for the purpose, to take possession of those islands, if they should not have been evacuated by the Greek authorities at the time when he receives his instructions. I am, &c.

(Signed) “ FREDK. ELLIOTT ”

This letter is dated the 6th of October, 1849. Is it to be vindicated, or is it to be given up to censure ? What judgment is the House of Commons to pass upon this grave transaction ? For the sake of these worthless islands you imperiously violated a right clear as the sun, the right of France and Russia to be consulted upon every question touching the integrity of Greek territory. You ordered possession to be taken of these islands months before France or Russia heard anything about it. And how were you saved from the consequences of so outrageous a proceeding ? By the greater discretion of your agents on the spot. Sir William Parker and Mr. Wyse took it upon themselves to suspend the execution of your orders ; and it is not until very lately that you have even given your reluctant

<sup>1</sup> Sir James Graham.

approval to that suspension, which has been the means of securing you from a most threatening crisis.

Sir, in turning to the question of our relations with France, as they have been compromised by the Greek affairs, I must set out with saying, that, as it appears to me, we are under very great obligations to that country. First, for the offer of her mediation or good offices ; and, secondly, for the spirit in which she proceeded to carry that offer into execution. For on the 16th of February, 1850, the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary thus stated to Mr. Wyse his opinion of Baron Gros—

“Baron Gros is a man of sense, and of a conciliatory disposition, and the choice seems to be a good one.” You are, I think, further obliged to France for the great efforts she made to meet your wishes in the consideration of these claims ; because I think it quite plain that if France had had to arbitrate, some 60,000 drachmas, or little over £2,000, would have been all that she could have awarded to us. Now, I do not think that the noble Lord has duly reciprocated these feelings on the part of France, or has done them justice in his own conduct. He did not, in my opinion, at any time keep Mr. Wyse properly informed as to the understanding on which it had been settled here that affairs should proceed at Athens. I will not dwell only upon the circumstances that the noble Lord could not find means for communicating to Mr. Wyse before the 17th of April what had been arranged between him and M. Drouyn de Lhuys on the 9th—though, from what we know of the noble Lord, I should have thought he could have compassed greater things than this ; nor upon the circumstance that when the 17th arrived, he did not then think proper to make a communication. Even before the 9th of April, and long before it, he had arranged with the Ambassador of France that it should rest wholly with the French negotiator at Athens to fix the termination of his own intervention, and that, until he announced it, the action of the squadron should remain absolutely suspended. The noble Lord himself has told us that M. Drouyn de Lhuys did not misunderstand him ; but when Baron Gros made known to Mr. Wyse that definition of his powers which had been transmitted to him on the authority of M. Drouyn de Lhuys, Mr. Wyse was utterly at fault, and on the 15th of April he writes to the noble Lord—

“I have not had the honour to receive any such instructions to this effect, nor am I aware how far such a case as that in which Baron Gros desires to stand has been contemplated by your Lordship,”

And the same ignorance on the part of Mr. Wyse, due to the noble Lord, on the occasion of the arrival of the *Vauban*, led to the final rupture, on which I will not dwell as to particulars ; but I will state in passing that, with respect to the dispute about the communications at Athens upon the arrival of the *Vauban*, there is no charge (as I think) affecting the honour either of Mr. Wyse or of Baron Gros ; and, resuming the main subject, I affirm that these limited communications to Mr. Wyse respecting the powers of Baron Gros give rise to the supposition, from which I think the noble Lord has yet to clear himself, that while he was negotiating at home with every profession and appearance of desiring an amicable settlement, he was not very unwilling that the matter should again go to the issue of force abroad.

But I pass to other matter, and I blame the noble Lord for having haggled with France upon the difference between the Convention of London and that of Athens, and for having attempted to evade acknowledging the extent of that difference. I think that the course he pursues in this part of the correspondence was quite unworthy of the courage which he shows in this House. In more than one despatch he struggles to make light of the differences between the two Conventions ; says Her Majesty's Government have scarcely any reason for preferring either one of them in the abstract to the other, but suggests gently that the one—namely, that of Athens—has taken effect, and it seems, therefore, a pity to disturb it. Now, Sir, I will call upon the House to give marked attention to this difference, which the noble Lord treats as so trivial. It pertains chiefly to that old subject of the claims on Portugal. By the Convention of Athens, not only was there a deposit of no less than 150,000 drachmas, which of itself tended to produce an idea that there was some considerable body and substance in the claims (which ideas might be very operative upon the judgment), but, what was still more important, a provision that the examination of the claims, and the decision of the amount, should be in the hands of the two Governments of England and Greece. Sir, we can all judge what this would mean in practice, while the recollections of January and April were yet fresh, and under the guns of Sir William Parker's squadron. It would mean that the claims should be settled by the preponderating influence of England. But very different is the Convention of London. First of all, it requires that M. Pacifico

shall prove his loss, not, as you had contended, that the Greek Government should disprove it ; secondly, there shall be no deposit. But the difference on which I rely is this ; the investigation of the claims is to be conducted, not between strong England and weak Greece alone, but between strong England and weak Greece, with strong France, not to render good offices, reducible to nothing, but to arbitrate and determine between them. That is the difference of which the noble Lord has made so light—a difference of provisions reaching over a claim of £26,000, or some five-sixths of all he had demanded. And, Sir, I do not scruple to express the opinion that, under the arrangement as it now stands, the claims of M. Pacífico for his Portuguese documents are virtually dead, and that if he sold them by auction no man would be found to make a bid for them. But the French Government, unhappily, could not be brought to see the almost identity of the two Conventions : they pressed the noble Lord hard and closely upon that subject, and after various attempts at escape, he was compelled to submit, I will say, to the humiliation which he has brought upon himself, and not only upon himself, but upon his country, resorting to violence in the first instance, then failing to fulfil his understanding with France, and so permitting a second resort to violence to occur at Athens ; and then being compelled by France, who, I must say, has justly vindicated her offended dignity to undo what his armament had done, and to accept the Convention of London even after that of Athens had been carried, so far as time permitted, into full effect.

But, Sir, it is not only with France that we have had to deal ; what is the lesson that Count Nesselrode has read to us ? The gentlemen of liberal politics, who have such favour to the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary, must surely, of all things, most desire, that England should not be humbled in the eyes of a foreign Power ; they must surely also say, and I sympathize with them, “ If we are to receive public lessons upon our conduct, let us receive them from those who have from infancy drunk the milk and breathed the breath of freedom like ourselves.” Not such has been our fate under the unhappy auspices of the noble Lord. And now, Sir, I will read at this late hour, and read, too, without apology. These grave and pregnant words of Count Nesselrode are words that may sting you while you hear them ; but to them, at least, you will not listen, as you justly might to me, with indifference. On the 19th of February

last, Count Nesselrode thus writes to the noble Lord—

“The reception which may be given to our representations may have considerable influence on the nature of the relations we are henceforth to expect from England ; let me add, on the position towards all the Powers, great or small, whose coast exposes them to a sudden attack. It remains, indeed, to be seen whether Great Britain, abusing the advantages which are afforded her by her immense maritime superiority——”

*(Interruption from conversation among some hon. Members.)*

What, Sir, are there gentlemen in this House who can pursue their idle chat, while words like these are sounding in their ears ? If there are, I must tell them frankly, that I am little mortified at their withholding from myself the compliment of their attention. And now I will resume—

“It remains, indeed, to be seen whether Great Britain, abusing the advantages which are afforded her by her immense maritime superiority, intends henceforward to pursue an isolated policy, without caring for those engagements which bind her to the other Cabinets ; whether she intends to detach herself from every obligation as well as from all community of action, and to authorize each great Power, whenever it shall find occasion, to recognize towards the weak no other rule but its own will, no other right but its own material force.”

That is the lesson which has been read to you—which has been read to you justly—which has been read to you without reply ; and this lesson, so read to you without reply, is a lesson from the mouth of the Autocrat of all the Russias.

And now, Sir, what compensation have we for this ? Why, we had the compensation of hearing a great speech from the noble Lord ; and, Sir, I, for one, assure the House that, as far as it goes, I do not undervalue that compensation. I respectfully assure the noble Lord, if he will permit me, that no man who sits in this House can be more sensible of the masterly character of that speech, alike remarkable as a physical and as an intellectual effort ; no man, even of those who sit beside him, listened with keener admiration and delight, while, from the dusk of one day until the dawn of the next, the noble Lord defended his policy, and through the livelong summer's night the British House of Commons, crowded as it was, hung upon his lips.

But in what remains, in the endeavours to canvass the noble Lord's general conduct, I must be brief. I will not at this time follow the noble Lord into the discussion of all those particular instances of his policy on which he dwells in reply to my right hon. friend the Member for Ripon,<sup>1</sup> and which, I do not

<sup>1</sup> Sir James Graham.

doubt, will be treated of by others who may follow me in the debate, and who are much more competent to discuss them. But there is plainly a great question of principle at issue between us, to which I cannot hesitate to advert. This is a matter in which mere words and mere definitions convey little meaning ; but the idea which I have in my mind is that commonly expressed by the word non-interference or non-intervention. Such a word, apart from all cavils as to exact definition, does convey a principle, a temper, a course of policy, which is practically understood and practically approved by the people of England. Sir, so strong is this House, with a strength founded both in its nature as a representative body and in its general conduct, that it can sometimes even afford to deviate a little from the true line of action ; its credit with the people may suffer some deduction, and yet remain in great vigour. You may, I say, afford the loss, but certain I am that you will incur such a loss, if you pass any vote which shall seem to disparage that principle and policy which shall be calculated to impress the people with the belief that you are infected with a mania and an itch for managing the affairs of other nations, and that you are not contented with your own weighty and honourable charge. The right hon. gentleman who spoke last has put a question which I will answer. He says, if we are not satisfied with the rule of his noble friend's proceedings, what is the antagonistic principle which we advance ? I answer him in that one word to which I have referred : it is, the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries. I subscribe to those declarations of general maxims that fell from him ; everything depends upon the tone and spirit of the man who has to act upon them. They are in themselves but vague abstractions : they acquire life, and weight, and vigour only as they take effect in administrative acts. Greatly as I respect in general the courage, the energy, the undoubted patriotism of the noble Lord, I accuse him of this, that his policy is marked and characterized by what I must call a spirit of interference. I hold that this is a fundamental fault : a fault not to be excused. The noble Lord tells us, indeed, that he does not go abroad to propagate extreme opinions in other countries ; and that I do not for a moment doubt. I do not doubt he has the feeling—which must, indeed, be the feeling of every Englishman, and especially of every Secretary of State in England for Foreign Affairs—which has been the feeling, I am convinced, of the various distinguished

persons who have held that office since the Peace—of the Earl of Aberdeen, of Mr. Canning, and of the Marquess of Londonderry likewise ; I mean a sincere desire that when a legitimate opportunity creates itself, and makes it our duty, in conformity with the principles of public law, to exercise a British influence in the regulation of the internal affairs of other countries, that influence should be exercised in the spirit which we derive from our own free and stable form of government, and in the sense of extending to such countries, as far as they are able and desirous to receive them, institutions akin to those of which we know from experience the inestimable blessings. Upon this there can be no difference of opinion among us ; no man who sits here can be the friend of absolute power any more than of license and disorder. There can be no difference upon the proposition that, considering how the nations of Europe are associated together, and, in some sense, organized as a whole, such occasions will of necessity from time to time arise ; but the difference among us arises upon this question : Are we, or are we not, to go abroad and make occasions for the propagation even of the political opinions which we consider to be sound ? I say we are not. I complain of the noble Lord that he is disposed to make these occasions : nay, he boasts that he makes them. He refers back to his early policy in Spain and Portugal, and he says it was to us a matter of very small moment whether Portugal were ruled by Dom Miguel or Donna Maria ; whether the Crown of Spain went to Don Carlos or to Donna Isabella ; but then, he says, there were opportunities of propagating the political sentiments which we think sound, and therefore we did what otherwise it might not have been wise to do. This doctrine, Sir, of the noble Lord is, I admit, a most alluring doctrine. We are soothed and pleased with denunciations the most impartial alike of tyranny and of anarchy ; and assured, I doubt not with truth, that the only part played by the noble Lord is that of the moderate reformer. Sir, I object to the propagandism even of moderate reform. In proportion as the representation is alluring, let us be on our guard. The noble Lord lays a snare for us, into which, as Englishmen, glorying in our country and its laws, we are but too likely to fall. We must remember that if we claim the right not only to accept, where they come spontaneously and by no act of ours, but to create and to catch at, opportunities for spreading in other countries the opinions of our own meridian, we must allow to every other nation, every

other Government, a similar license both of judgment and of action. What is to be the result? That if in every country the name of England is to be the symbol and the nucleus of a party, the name of France, of Russia, or of Austria, may and will be the same. And are you not, then, laying the foundation of a system hostile to the real interests of freedom, and destructive to the peace of the world?

Sir, we hear something in this debate of success as not being the true test of the excellence of public measures. And God forbid that I should say it is their true test, when you are in your own sphere, minding your own affairs. But when you think fit to go out of that sphere and to manage those of other people for them, then do I think success throws much light upon the examination of the question whether your intervention was wise and just. Interference in foreign countries, Sir, according to my mind, should be rare, deliberate, decisive in character, and effectual for its end. Success will usually show that you saw your way, and that the means you used were adapted and adequate to their purpose. Such, if I read them aright, were the acts done by Mr. Canning in the nature of intervention: they were few, and they were effectual—effectual whether when, in his own noble language, he “called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old,” or when, founding himself on the obligations of public law, he despatched the troops of England to prevent the march of a Spanish force into Portugal. I do not find the same character in the interventions of the noble Lord opposite. I cannot look upon all that has taken place during the four years which are the subject-matter of this Motion, without seeing a rash desire, an habitual desire, of interference—a disposition to make the occasions of it, and, that which will always follow, a disposition, in making them to look too slightly at the restraints imposed by the letter and spirit of the law of nations. I will confine myself to a single illustration. We have heard from the noble Lord what he has to say in vindication of his offer, or at least of his suggestion, of the Sicilian crown to the Duke of Genoa. Could any dispassionate hearer conceive his defence to be a good one? He took credit for this: that his offer to recognize the title was contingent upon the Duke of Genoa’s obtaining positive possession of the crown of Sicily. Sir, I never heard of any royalty, of any government except two: either one *de jure*, or at the least one *de facto*. I cannot give the noble Lord much credit

for not having recognized a title which, beyond all dispute, existed neither *de jure* nor *de facto*. Sir, I protest against these anticipations of occasion, on every ground both of policy and of justice. The general doctrine is that we are not entitled to recognize a Government, far less to suggest one, until we see it established, and have presumptive evidence that it springs from a national source. If we move without that evidence, and broach some favourite scheme of our own, it becomes the sport and the shuttlecock of circumstances, and we become so along with it. I am the more willing to argue this principle in the instance of Naples, because the spirit of Neapolitan institutions is so far removed from that of our own, that the prejudices of every one who hears me must be unfavourable; and particularly must our sympathies be diverted from that Government, as respects the particular case of Sicily. The more we may be tempted to sympathize with Sicily, the less we admire Neapolitan institutions and usages of government, the more tenacious, as I contend, we should be of our duty to do them full justice—the more careful that we do not, because we differ from them, impair in their case the application of those great and sacred principles that govern and harmonize the intercourse between States, and from which you never can depart, without producing mischiefs by the violation of the rule, a thousandfold greater than any benefit you may promise yourself to achieve in the special instance. I say, therefore, that the noble Viscount, when he thus anticipated the dismemberment of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, pointing to that as likely to occur which had not occurred, and which was not to occur, and in which he had no legitimate concern, did an act which breathed the spirit of hostility towards a friendly Power, an act at variance with duty, and an act ill adapted to advance the true interests of freedom in that or in any other country. And if, Sir, departing from the higher ground of duty and of justice, I must invoke considerations of prudence also, I say that we, the Parliament of this widely-extended empire, which has its innumerable limbs dispersed through the wide world from one of its extremities to the other, are not in a condition to deal lightly with those laws which prohibit allied nations from seeking to compass the dismemberment of one another. We might conceive a case. We might suppose that in the insurrection of Canada a portion of the province might for a time have been in possession of the insurgents; what view should

she have taken of the conduct of a foreign Power which, while the contest was still doubtful, and before our gallant troops would have shown their inability to hold the soil they were defending for their sovereign and their country, had foreshown events as yet contingent, perhaps never to be realized, and had presumed to indicate to the people, who were still no more than insurgents, the choice of a particular head or a particular form of government ?

Sir, I am well prepared, following the example of other and more distinguished men, to bear my share in the abuse which, I doubt not, may attend the part which we shall take on this occasion. I am prepared to hear it said that we are espousing the cause, as against England, of countries other than our own ; that we cabal against the noble Lord because he is the protector of Englishmen domiciled abroad. Sir, I deny that he has truly protected Englishmen by the course he has pursued. I hold that no Minister in his place can really give to Englishmen resident in foreign lands either an effectual or a permanent protection, except by a careful observance of the principles that have been consecrated by the universal assent of mankind for governing the conduct of nation to nation. In vain do you talk to us of a knot of foreign conspirators : the only knot of foreign conspirators against the noble Lord, is the combined opinion of civilized Europe. In vain you talk of the two kinds of revolutionists—the revolutionists who will have too much reform for the noble Lord's taste, and the revolutionists who will have too little. These, he says, are the persons opposed to him and his moderate reforms, and all on grounds petty, paltry, narrow and personal, but under his description there will, I fear, be found to fall nearly every party in nearly every country of Christendom.

Sir, great as is the influence and power of Britain, she cannot afford to follow, for any length of time, a self-isolating policy. It would be a contravention of the law of nature and of God, if it were possible for any single nation of Christendom to emancipate itself from the obligations which bind all other nations, and to arrogate, in the face of mankind, a position of peculiar privilege. And now I will grapple with the noble Lord on the ground which he selected for himself, in the most triumphant portion of his speech, by his reference to those emphatic words, *Civis Romanus sum*. He vaunted, amidst the cheers of his supporters, that under his administration an Englishman should

be, throughout the world, what the citizen of Rome had been. What then, Sir, was a Roman citizen? He was the member of a privileged caste; he belonged to a conquering race, to a nation that held all others bound down by the strong arm of power. For him there was to be an exceptional system of law; for him principles were to be asserted, and by him rights were to be enjoyed, that were denied to the rest of the world. Is such, then, the view of the noble Lord, as to the relation that is to subsist between England and other countries? Does he make the claim for us, that we are to be uplifted upon a platform high above the standing-ground of all other nations? It is, indeed, too clear, not only from the expressions, but from the whole spirit of the speech of the noble Viscount, that too much of this notion is lurking in his mind; that he adopts in part that vain conception, that we, forsooth, have a mission to be the censors of vice and folly, of abuse and imperfection, among the other countries of the world; that we are to be the universal schoolmasters; and that all those who hesitate to recognize our office, can be governed only by prejudice or personal animosity, and should have the blind war of diplomacy forthwith declared against them. And certainly if the business of a Foreign Secretary properly were to carry on such diplomatic wars, all must admit that the noble Lord is a master in the discharge of his functions. What, Sir, ought a Foreign Secretary to be? Is he to be like some gallant knight at a tournament of old, pricking forth into the lists, armed at all points, confiding in his sinews and his skill, challenging all comers for the sake of honour, and having no other duty than to lay as many as possible of his adversaries sprawling in the dust? If such is the idea of a good Foreign Secretary, I, for one, would vote to the noble Lord his present appointment for his life. But, Sir, I do not understand the duty of a Secretary for Foreign Affairs to be of such a character. I understand it to be his duty to conciliate peace with dignity. I think it to be the very first of all his duties studiously to observe, and to exalt in honour among mankind, that great code of principles which is termed the law of nations, which the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield<sup>1</sup> has found, indeed, to be very vague in their nature, and greatly dependent on the discretion of each particular country; but in which I find, on the contrary, a great and noble monument of human wisdom, founded on the combined dictates of reason

<sup>1</sup> Mr. J. A. Roebuck.

and experience—a precious inheritance bequeathed to us by the generations that have gone before us, and a firm foundation on which we must take care to build whatever it may be our part to add to their acquisitions, if, indeed, we wish to maintain and to consolidate the brotherhood of nations, and to promote the peace and welfare of the world.

Sir, the English people, whom we are here to represent, are indeed a great and noble people ; but it adds nothing to their greatness or their nobleness, that when we assemble in this place we should trumpet forth our virtues in elaborate panegyrics, and designate those who may not be wholly of our mind as a knot of foreign conspirators. When, indeed, I heard the hon. and learned gentleman the Member for Sheffield <sup>1</sup> glorifying us, together with the rest of the people of this country, and announcing that we soared in unapproachable greatness, and the like, I confess I felt that eulogies such as those savoured somewhat of bombast ; and thought it much to the honour of this House that the praises thus vented seemed to fall so flat ; that the cookery of the hon. and learned gentleman was evidently seasoned beyond the capacity and relish of our palates. It is this insular temper, and this self-glorifying tendency, which the policy of the noble Lord and the doctrines of his supporters tend so much to foment, and which has given to that policy the quarrelsome character that marks some of their speeches ; for, indeed, it seems as if there lay upon the noble Lord an absolute necessity for quarrelling. No doubt it makes a difference what may be the institutions of one country or another. If he can, he will quarrel with an absolute monarchy. If he cannot find an absolute monarchy for the purpose, he will quarrel with one which is limited. If he cannot find even that, yet, sooner than not quarrel at all, he will quarrel with a republic. He has lately shown us this in the case of France : he showed it once before in the case of America. The tenacious memory of the noble Lord reached back to transactions many years farther off than 1843 : he referred to the foundation of the throne in Belgium, which was under Earl Grey's Government, and had nothing to do with the present Motion ; but I am sorry it should not have retained what happened to him in 1843 respecting the Ashburton treaty, when this House, by its vote upon that treaty, read him a lesson of which he seems not to have reaped the benefit. The House of Commons at that

<sup>1</sup> Mr J. A. Roebuck.

time had the good sense to take a dispassionate view of a question depending between ourselves and a foreign country, and, rejecting the advice of the noble Lord, which must have led to a rupture between the two Powers, showed that it had no fear even of being thought afraid.

Sir, I say the policy of the noble Lord tends to encourage and confirm in us that which is our besetting fault and weakness, both as a nation and as individuals. Let an Englishman travel where he will as a private person, he is found in general to be upright, high-minded, brave, liberal, and true ; but with all this, foreigners are too often sensible of something that galls them in his presence, and I apprehend it is because he has too great a tendency to self-esteem—too little disposition to regard the feelings, the habits, and the idea of others. Sir, I find this characteristic too plainly legible in the policy of the noble Lord. I doubt not that use will be made of our present debate to work upon this peculiar weakness of the English mind. The people will be told that those who oppose the Motion are governed by personal motives, have no regard for public principle, no enlarged ideas of national policy. You will take your case before a favourable jury, and you think to gain your verdict ; but, Sir, let the House of Commons be warned—let it warn itself—against all illusions. There is in this case also a course of appeal. There is an appeal, such as the hon. and learned Member for Sheffield<sup>1</sup> has made, from the one House of Parliament to the other. There is a further appeal from this House of Parliament to the people of England ; but, lastly, there is also an appeal from the people of England to the general sentiment of the civilized world ; and I, for my part, am of opinion that England will stand shorn of a chief part of her glory and her pride if she shall be found to have separated herself, through the policy she pursues abroad, from the moral supports which the general and fixed convictions of mankind afford—if the day shall come in which she may continue to excite the wonder and the fear of other nations, but in which she shall have no part in their affection and their regard:

No, Sir, let it not be so : let us recognize, and recognize with frankness, the equality of the weak with the strong ; the principles of brotherhood among nations, and of their sacred independence. When we are asking for the maintenance of the rights which belong to our fellow-subjects resident in Greece,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. J. A. Roebuck.

let us do as we would be done by, and let us pay all the respect to a feeble State, and to the infancy of free institutions, which we should desire and should exact from others towards their maturity and their strength. Let us refrain from all gratuitous and arbitrary meddling in the internal concerns of other States, even as we should resent the same interference if it were attempted to be practised towards ourselves. If the noble Lord has indeed acted on these principles, let the Government to which he belongs have your verdict in its favour ; but if he has departed from them, as I contend, and as I humbly think and urge upon you that it has been too amply proved, then the House of Commons must not shrink from the performance of its duty, under whatever expectations of momentary obloquy or reproach, because we shall have done what is right ; we shall enjoy the peace of our consciences, and receive, whether a little sooner or a little later, the approval of the public voice, for having entered our solemn protest against a system of policy which we believe, nay, which we know, whatever may be its first aspect must of necessity in its final results be unfavourable even to the security of British subjects resident abroad, which it professes so much to study—unfavourable to the dignity of the country, which the Motion of the hon. and learned Member asserts that it preserves—and equally unfavourable to that other great and sacred object which also it suggests to our recollection, the maintenance of peace with the nations of the world.

## SPEECH ON DISRAELI'S BUDGET

DECEMBER 16, 1852

When the Conservatives, with the valuable assistance of Lord Palmerston, had turned out the Government of Lord John Russell in 1852, Lord Derby became Prime Minister for the first time, and Mr. Disraeli was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer. His first Budget attracted little notice, and, with the immediate prospect of a General Election, supplies were only voted for six months. But after the Elections, which led to no very decisive result, Disraeli brought forward another Budget in December, and this was attacked by Gladstone in the following speech. It was the first occasion upon which he came into direct personal conflict with his future rival. He argued that the Budget did not really provide for the expenses of the coming year, and he also protested against weakening the income-tax by the exemption of precarious incomes, commercial or professional, without regard to their amount. Much of the speech, which is full of vigour and animation, was directed against the tone and style of Disraeli's onslaught upon his opponents. But its result was to destroy the Budget, and it laid down in broad outline the principles of finance which Gladstone afterwards followed himself. The income-tax was at that time very unpopular, and much threatened from various quarters by social, as well as economic, objections. Gladstone declared with great emphasis that it could not be preserved if its foundations were undermined, and that to tamper with it would destroy the corner-stone of national credit.

I AM reluctant, Mr. Patten, to trespass upon the attention of the Committee, but it appears to me that the speech we have just heard <sup>1</sup> is a speech that ought to meet with a reply, and that, too, on the moment; and, Sir, I begin by telling the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that I postpone for some minutes the inquiry whether he knows business or not, that there are some things which he, too, has yet to learn. There were other reasons, besides the reason of triviality and irrelevancy, why a discussion should have been avoided to-night by the right hon. gentleman on the subject of emigration. And I tell the right hon. gentleman more—that the licence of language he has used—the phrases he has applied to the characters of public men—(*Loud cries of "Hear, hear!"*)—that the phrases he has applied to the characters of public men, whose career—(*The remainder of the sentence was drowned in renewed cries from both sides of the House*)—Mr. Patten, my

<sup>1</sup> From Mr. Disraeli, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

wish is to keep myself, although I confess that I could not hear those phrases used and remain totally unmoved—my wish is to keep myself strictly within the bounds of Parliamentary order and propriety, and I beg of you, Sir, that if in one syllable I trespass beyond those bounds, you will have the kindness to correct me. I do not address myself to those gentlemen belonging to the great party opposite, from whom I have never received anything but courtesy and forbearance—(*Interruption*)—but, notwithstanding the efforts of some gentlemen in a remote corner of the House, who avail themselves of darkness to interrupt me, I will tell them this, that they must bear to have their Chancellor of the Exchequer, who is so free in his comments upon the conduct of others, brought to the bar of the opinion of this Committee, and tried by those laws of decency and propriety—(*Cheers and confusion, which drowned the remainder of the sentence.*) Sir, we are accustomed here to attach to the words of the Minister of the Crown a great authority—and that disposition to attach authority, as it is required by the public interest, so it has been usually justified by the conduct and character of those Ministers; but I must tell the right hon. gentleman that he is not entitled to charge with insolence men who—(*Renewed cheers again drowned the remaining words of the sentence.*) I must tell the right hon. gentleman that he is not entitled to say to my right hon. friend the Member for Carlisle<sup>1</sup> that he regards him, but that he does not respect him. I must tell the right hon. gentleman that whatever he has learned—and he has learned much—he has not yet learned the limits of discretions of moderation, and of forbearance, that ought to restrain the conduct and language of every Member of this House, the disregard of which is an offence in the meanest amongst us, but it is of tenfold weight when committed by the leader of the House of Commons. And now, Sir, passing on from this most painful subject, I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the vote that is before us, and convey to them my opinion of the position in which we stand. We are coming to a vote, Sir, on the first of a series of Resolutions which have been placed in your hands. In that first Resolution was contained two leading propositions, in which the proposal now made to the Committee varies the present state of the law. By one of these propositions the area on which the house tax is laid is extended beyond that space which it at present occupies, but is extended only to houses

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. Graham.

of the value of £10. By the other of these provisions the rate of the house tax is doubled, and it has been said to-night, and it has been said on other occasions, that if gentlemen will but vote for the double house tax on this occasion, they will be perfectly free to depart from and alter that vote on any future stages of the measure. Now, Sir, it is most important that we should know in what sense this is true. I apprehend that we have here an unbounded liberty of action, that there are a vast number of stages provided in every measure in order that every gentleman may reconsider the judgment which he has formed, that it is open to any Member of Parliament to vote for and against every measure that passes through the House at its alternate stages. This is the liberty, and no other, which you will have to vary the amount of the house tax, when the present Resolution is once passed. You have perfect liberty to do that. You may reduce the tax to 1s. on the bringing up of the Report ; you may bring it down to 6*d.* at a further stage, and on the third reading of the Bill you may abolish it altogether ; you may adopt that as you may any other perfectly inconsistent course upon any proceeding in which this House or this Committee is engaged. This is the precise amount of your licence, and I wish you now to recollect that you are not now engaged in the performance of a mere technical and formal duty. There is a meaning and sense in the rules of this House which require that the imposition of taxes shall be preceded by a Committee. The object of that Committee is not to obtain a formal sanction to a new tax, but to have a thorough sifting and searching discussion, and to give all the authority by the decision of that Committee which can possibly be given to a proposal for any new tax. And now we have heard the right hon. gentleman speaking in language of the severest condemnation of those who have withdrawn their Budgets. His recollection goes back to Mr. Pitt ; he is fresh in the dates of 1848. Does he recollect the events of this evening ? Does he remember—his memory sometimes requires to be refreshed—does he remember that this evening we had it declared by the organ of the Government that the increase of the house tax was the principle of the vote, and that by that vote the Government would stand or fall ? And then, by the mouth of the right hon. gentleman the Home Secretary,<sup>1</sup> he stated that he was perfectly willing to accede to an Amendment which, introducing into the Resolution

<sup>1</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.

the terms "not exceeding one shilling," would have divested it of the character of an increase, and have abandoned and given up the proposition upon which the Government had taken its stand. And one hon. and learned gentleman who spoke to-night complimented myself and my friends upon the great vigilance which we had exercised. If he had meant his words as a compliment, I should have valued them as well for the manner in which he spoke as for the high character of the speaker ; but they were meant as a reproach, and all I have to say, with respect to that vigilance, is this, that if it was great, I never knew an occasion upon which there was an equal demand for vigilance. I did not on all occasions approve of the financial policy of the right hon. gentleman the Member for Halifax.<sup>1</sup> I opposed him, I remember, on one occasion, in company with the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the occasion on which we opposed him was not half so unexceptionable as the present. But the proposals of that right hon. gentleman, whether they were advanced or whether they were withdrawn, were advanced or withdrawn, as the case may be, in a manner the most frank, the most straightforward, the most free from all suspicion of evasion, and the least requiring vigilant inspection. Now, Sir, I reject the Resolution in your hands, whether considered as a vote on the house tax, or a vote on the Budget, I reject it as a Resolution on the house tax, being at the same time by no means prepared to concur with those gentlemen who have expressed themselves in a manner unfriendly to the principle of an extended house tax. On the contrary, while sensible of the disadvantages of that peculiar form of taxation, yet I think if the difficulties were fairly met, that it might be placed on a widened area at a moderate rate, and that it might in that shape form a most convenient area of the financial system of the country. But there are many difficulties attending the house tax, which appear to me either to have been overlooked altogether, or, if considered, to have been decided wrongly in the proposition before the Committee. For example, whether the area should be widened beyond the limit of £10 is a question upon which I must say the right hon. gentleman has offered no justification for the proposal of the Government. The question whether it would be wise to graduate the rates of duty upon houses is one which does not seem even to have met the notice of the Government. Now, it should be recollected that in our

<sup>1</sup> Sir F. Wood.

previous house tax Act this law of graduation was expressly included, and I am not prepared to vote for the adoption of the proposal of the right hon. gentleman, which disregards the principle upon which the former house tax was based, without at least hearing some reasons why we should abandon what appears to me, on the whole, to be a salutary arrangement of the graduation of the house tax. Again, Sir, there is a most important question with reference to the relative ratings of town and country, or rather of this metropolis and the provinces, in respect to the house tax. It is impossible to examine the terms of this house tax, and find that London and Middlesex pay very nearly one-half of the whole amount, without being convinced that the whole matter of the rating requires to be placed under some special supervision if you resort to the house tax as a great instrument in your financial system. Well, Sir, there is a gross flaw in the house tax which has been exposed by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Portsmouth.<sup>1</sup> Then how are you to justify the doubling of the rate of the house tax? I cannot justify a scheme so grossly unequal as that which taxes, it would seem, the mansion of Knowle on £50 a year; while the shopkeeper in London is taxed on £250 or £200. Why have not these things been considered? After the deliberation of months, the right hon. gentleman produces a plan which, I confess, it appears to me that he might have as well given to us the first hour after he took office as after the six months during which he has remained in office. There is another question—a most important question—namely, whether in regard to houses of low value the tax ought to be collected from the landlord or from the occupier—a question the solution of which may greatly facilitate the consideration of the whole matter. But the right hon. gentleman has nothing to say on this point—it never crossed his mind, although he has spoken five hours on one night and three hours on another, and he found room to tell us that he was about to make a change in the Irish Office and in some other Office; but he did not devote one moment to describe the reasons why he entirely passed by the consideration of this great question, the whole of which it is necessary to search and sift to the bottom before the right hon. gentleman comes forward with a proposition for doubling the house tax. I tell the right hon. gentleman plainly that I will not legislate upon the house tax, either for this Govern-

<sup>1</sup> Sir F. Baring.

ment or for any Government whatsoever, until I see that all those questions which are now opened up have at least been fairly considered, and that the decisions which have been arrived at upon them, whether they meet with my approval or not, are decisions conformable with the rational and deliberate convictions of the House of Commons. The right hon. gentleman must excuse me if I now impeach his policy upon a ground somewhat more broad than even that of the house tax. I can hardly conceive a reason which would induce me to consent, not to a single proposition, but a financial scheme which introduces into the taxation of the country two, and only two, new taxes, and which is so adroitly contrived that both of these taxes, being both of them direct taxes, shall strike precisely the same class. I know not—it is impossible to know—whether that was the object of the right hon. gentleman; but if it had been his object, I defy him to have hit upon a nicer and more accurate calculation. The man whose income is from £50 to £150 is also the man who lives in a house of from £10 to £20 rent. And now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman has rallied my right hon. friend the Member for Carlisle<sup>1</sup> on the subject of the poor clerks. The right hon. gentleman is fond of instances. I will try him upon instances; and, as I know he may not have any peculiar sympathy for the poor clerks, I will go to those classes for which we all know the warmth and redundancy of the sympathy of the right hon. gentleman. I want to know how his financial scheme will bear upon the yeoman of this country in occupation of his own lands. That is a class that I know the right hon. gentleman esteems. In the days when he was accustomed to make Motions in this House upon the subject of agricultural distress, he used carefully to inform you that it would be a gross mistake, if, in viewing the agricultural interest, you looked only to the great landlords; there was a very large class of men—amongst the most valuable in the community—the yeomen, the ancient proprietors of England, that truly English class, who seem even now to revive among you especially, and more than any other, the days and the institutions of your Anglo-Saxon forefathers. The right hon. gentleman was earnest in their behalf. Now, how does he propose to use them? I take the case of an occupier of lands of his own to the value of £80 a year—no uncommon case. This man, I will suppose, lives probably in a £12 house. At present

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. Graham.

he pays no house tax and no income tax, and perhaps his lands are heavy wheat lands too. Well, he pays no house tax and no income tax. He hears that his friends have come into office. He has not a moment's hesitation—he has boundless confidence in the talents of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Forgive me if I explain that I do not question the genius of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I pay to him the sincere respect that genius deserves. I do not wish to go into any other—I will not mix any other consideration with the feeling which I express. Between the right hon. gentleman and myself there never has been anything in the nature of a misunderstanding, as regards personal matters. His measures and his political conduct I freely canvass; but to his genius I pay as willing a testimony as can be rendered by his most ardent admirers. But now I am describing the feelings of this poor yeoman. It is just because of the reality of the right hon. gentleman's talents that the more bitter will be the disappointment of my poor yeoman. He knows the abilities of the right hon. gentleman. He knows more—he knows the high character as well as the distinguished station of the noble Earl at the head of the Government.<sup>1</sup> He knows and thinks that, if his friends cannot do all that he expects, or that they wish to do for him, at least they will shield him from further injury. He has given up protection—he has given up compensation; but surely he is not to be wounded at their hands. But how is he treated? He is smitten by three taxes of which he has hitherto known nothing. Upon his £80 of his lands he must pay 7*d.*; and this amounts to £2 6*s.* 8*d.* His profits bring him within the magic line of Schedule E, and this adds 11*s.* 8*d.* more to his burden; besides which he has to pay 18*s.* as his contribution to the house tax. Therefore, in consequence of the advent of the right hon. gentleman to power, and of that brilliant and triumphant success which the right hon. gentleman anticipates already for his Budget, this poor yeoman will have to pay three taxes of which he has hitherto known nothing—these three amounting to 5 per cent. upon his gross income; and he is told that he may save a fiftieth part of the sum upon his tea and his beer. This is the result of the advent to power of the farmer's friends. Well, if he is a reflective man, and accustomed to contemplate the works of nature, and the revolutions of the seasons, he may draw his comparisons in his own mind between the four familiar divisions of the year and

<sup>1</sup> Lord Derby.

the four visits of the tax-gatherer, upon each of which he makes his demand. I take another instance, that of a class to whom the right hon. Chancellor of the Exchequer also shows tender and affectionate regard, and that class is the Clergy. Sir, the right hon. gentleman proposes to introduce on behalf of the clergy, and of the clergy alone, a special exemption on the income tax. He proposes to take them out of that class of life-renters—I mean those of them who have under £100 a year—he takes them out of the class of life-renters to which they belong, and to grant them the benefit of a peculiar exemption. Well, I must confess, while there is no man more bound than I am to study the interests, the temporal interests, of the clergy in this House, I must confess that I am far from convinced of the wisdom of bestowing upon them an exceptional privilege. I do not wish to see the clergy held up as invested, not only with the public endowments that they enjoy, to the satisfaction as well as to the benefit, I believe, of the public, but with exceptional privileges that may attract odium and envy. But, Sir, the clergy have a real grievance at this moment. It is admitted by all authorities—Professor Jones, Mr. Cornewall Lewis, and every man who has examined the subject of local rating will tell you—that the clergy suffer cruelly by being rated for local taxation upon their gross incomes. Now, I would rather redress that grievance of the clergy than grant them a new and exceptional privilege. What is the feeling, I want to know, of the clergy of £120 a year, under the circumstances of the accession of the right hon. gentleman to power? I am supposing the case of the village clergyman, who will fall, therefore, under the sweep of the right hon. gentleman's income tax. This clergyman has greater reason, if possible, than the yeoman, to build expectations upon the right hon. gentleman's accession to office, because it is from local taxation that this clergyman suffers. It is from local taxation that the clergyman suffers, and who, I want to know, is the great doctor of all England on the subject of local taxation? That clergyman will have watched with the deepest interest the past career of the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He will have seen that he has argued the grievances of local taxation with the utmost power, with unrivalled assiduity, and with that peculiar pathos which always belongs to great earnestness. What will have been the clergyman's expectations on this occasion, and what will be his condition? Why, he will have read

the speech of the right hon. gentleman on the introduction of his Budget—he will have found that the right hon. gentleman, with a gravity which cannot be too highly commended, stated in detail the case of the agriculturists under the head of local taxation, wrapped up all their claims in a bundle, and pitched them into the bottomless abyss of the future. Sir, we are sometimes told, and I agree with it, that there is much, not only in the doing of a thing, but in the manner in which it is done. Those who were present in this House will recollect the manner in which this was done. I myself have voted with the right hon. gentleman on previous occasions for the relief of the farmer in respect of local taxation. I did it at much expense of feeling, and I have been often censured for that vote. I did it in no vain idea that the landlords of this country were entitled to compensation for the repeal of the corn laws. I did it, whether rightly or wrongly, simply upon this principle—that there was much of feeling mixed up with this question, and that the farmer of this country was passing through a crisis in which the holding out of a helping hand by Parliament would have given him in a moment of uncertainty and of danger the greatest encouragement to persevere in that struggle his success in which was essential to us all. I, therefore, had these feelings on the subject of local taxation; but I must say that if I had been the sternest and bitterest opponent of the granting of a single farthing of relief to the farmer, I would have been perfectly satisfied with the matter, and the manner when, in his speech on the Budget, the right hon. gentleman disposed finally of the question of local taxation. Well, Sir, that is the case with the clergyman. His expectations, like the farmer's, are smashed. He will have to pay income tax on his income of £120 a year, and to pay on his house of £15 rent towards the house tax; although at present he knows nothing of either the house tax or the income tax. If the right hon. gentleman's Budget—I make the supposition—I think it is a strong one—if his Budget succeeds, this clergyman will pay £3 10s. 3d. in income tax, and £1 2s. 6d. house tax, making together £4 12s. 9d., or nearly 4 per cent. of his income. That will be the consequence of the right hon. gentleman's accession to office. Well, my third reason (and it is the only other reason with which I will trouble the Committee) for opposing the reduplication of the house tax, is because it is connected with the repeal of the malt tax. Now, on the question of the repeal of the malt tax, I mean to give no opinion which would

exclude, under favourable circumstances, its fair and favourable consideration. Although I grant you you ought not to regard the consumption of malt with precisely the same favour as you can look upon the consumption of tea or coffee, yet on the other hand I must recollect that while malt liquor is conterminous on the one side with tea and coffee, it is conterminous on the other side with the article of spirits, and is still the old beverage of the country ; and if you could succeed in breaking down the monopoly of the brewer's trade, and also effect a modification of the licensing system, thereby giving freedom to the trade, and ensuring real relief to the consumer, and which, if it was found necessary, would still leave you a revenue from the article in its final manufactured state—if such a scheme as that could be devised, then I think that the repeal of the malt tax might fairly, under certain circumstances, come under the consideration of this House. But the scheme before us has no one of these recommendations. The hon. Baronet the Member for East Kent<sup>1</sup> made a most admirable and candid speech on this subject. He said that the repeal of one-half the malt tax would do little or no good, but he accepted it as a stepping-stone ; and if I may venture to interpret in words what he did not fully express, I understood him to mean that the repeal of half the malt tax would leave the remainder of it in a position so indefensible, would exhibit the tax as so unsatisfactory in itself, and would make the amount of evil entailed by the restriction so monstrous, as compared with the remainder, that it would be a powerful lever for effecting the abolition of the rest of the tax. That was the reason in my opinion which influenced the hon. Baronet. But that is not a reason which can or ought to influence the House of Commons. If we have got, which I shall show that we have not, £2,500,000 of public income to dispose of, we must dispose of it in the best manner we can. It is not enough to say that you will do something by the change. You must look over the existing duties calmly and candidly, and consider by what relief or remission you can do the greatest good to the consumer, to trade, and to the revenue. By that rule, and by that rule only, we can judge. And if a latent idea lurks in the minds of some that although the malt tax may not be a very good tax to propose for the public interest—may not be a very good proposition for the public interest, yet that there is a smack and a savour of com-

<sup>1</sup> Sir E. Dering.

pensation to the public interest about it—then I must say that, in the first place, I think it untrue in the point of fact; and that, in the second place, it is entirely at variance with the principle which the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has himself laid down to-night, and on other nights, in the fairest and most explicit manner, that all remissions of taxation must be judged of as public benefits, and that if any benefit accrue to the grower or producer of any article, it must be merely that accidental benefit that mostly accrues to the producer of any article the tax upon which is reduced or repealed. The right hon. gentleman has been facetious to-night on the argument that the reduction of the malt tax will not reach the consumer. He purported to aim these shafts exclusively at the gentlemen opposed to him; but it did not appear to me that there was a sidelong dart which found its way to the side of one of the most respectable Members of this House—the hon. Member for the North Riding of Yorkshire.<sup>1</sup> There is not a greater authority on the subject of the malt tax than that hon. gentleman; and what estimate does he give us after having studied the question during the whole of his Parliamentary career? What does he say as to the amount of the benefit which is to reach the consumer from the repeal of one-half of the malt tax? He says that 5*d.* is the present price of a quart of beer; 2*d.* is the cost price of it,  $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* is the duty; 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* is, as he says, the effect in one way or another of the double monopoly of the brewers and of the malt tax. Half of three farthings, or three-eighths of a penny, is then the amount of the reduction on a quart of beer. That is, what is now 5*d.* will hereafter be 4 $\frac{5}{8}$ *d.* That is the reduction for which we are now called upon to surrender £2,500,000 of public revenue. Taking the reduction as I have stated it, it would amount to 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on the cost of the article: but even supposing there was a reduction of 10 per cent., I want to know how that is to tell on the recovery of the revenue. The right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has become a pupil of free trade, and is now going to legislate on the principles of free trade. One main consideration I must tell him in the reduction of a duty is the way in which it will stimulate the self-reproducing powers of the revenue. And I want to know how the £5,000,000 that he now receives from malt are to be reproduced, or what portion of these £5,000,000 we are to receive under the reduced duty. He

<sup>1</sup> Mr. E. S. Cayley.

explained to-night what I confess was to me before obscure. He tells us that for 1854-5 he has estimated his loss at £1,700,000 upon peculiar grounds: £600,000 he will then obtain, which will be a payment once for all, and which thereafter will not accrue. £200,000 is the modest sum he estimates for the increased consumption.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: £400,000.

MR. GLADSTONE: If it is £400,000 I am afraid he is rather extravagant in that expectation. You are now going to reduce the malt tax in a manner which will give a reduction of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., or we will say 10 per cent., on the price of the article; and the question is, what increase will that effect in the consumption? In 1830 my right hon. friend near me effected a reduction more than twice as great by the repeal of the beer duty. By that repeal of the beer duty he took 20 per cent. off the price of the article; and we now find that, after the lapse of twenty-two years, the aggregate increase up to this moment is only 25 per cent. Well, if 25 per cent. increase in the consumption is produced in twenty-two years by a remission of duty amounting to 20 per cent. on the price of the article, I want to know what is to be the amount of the reproduction of the revenue that he now proposes to sacrifice? Well, now, that is the most important light in which this question strikes me; but I must say that I consider his scheme an irrational one if considered with regard to producers, and to any relief that he may desire to give them. He has got a distressed class, for I will assume that they are distressed. There may, indeed, be some question about that; but there is a class that have been distressed and have suffered. These are the cultivators of the heavy wheat lands, and how does he propose to relieve them? By a boon to the cultivators of the light lands. But how is this boon to reach the cultivators of the heavy lands? Why it is to be filtered through a fourfold or a fivefold strainer, and I will certainly give but little to the farmer of wheat lands for the advantage which will reach him. In the first place, it is to be filtered through the closely organized trade of the maltster, and secondly, through the still more closely organized trade of the brewers. It is then to be still further diminished by the effect of the system of licensing public-houses, and then any benefit of the reduction which may survive these three is to be encountered by foreign competition, and in comes the malt from Belgium and other places to meet the British grower

of barley. But the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made another most important announcement to-night, that is, the withdrawal of the Excise credits.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Not the withdrawal.

MR. GLADSTONE: I confess I cannot exactly make out the measure the right hon. gentleman proposes, but it is at any rate a reduction or diminution of those credits. He proposes to withdraw £600,000, which is practically an advance to the maltsters. How does that advance operate? That subject was explained by Sir Robert Peel in 1830, who then showed that the system of advancing capital to the maltster was to no small degree a compensation for any burden which the duty might entail upon the grower; for you actually put capital into the hands of the traders, by means of that arrangement, the plain effect of which—whether wise or not in another point of view, I do not now inquire—is, that it facilitates the entrance of competitors into the malt trade, and by multiplying the number of purchasers of barley secures the farmer a better price. That £600,000 is to be taken back, the number of maltsters will be proportionably narrowed, and the competition for the farmers' produce proportionably diminished, and the price consequently lowered. Besides the extreme partiality of the operation of this remission, I look upon it as one of the most inefficient measures that could be devised for the relief of those agriculturists who are alone in a position to urge that they have been distressed, I allude to the cultivators of heavy lands. I must observe that it is altogether, as it appears to me, a most delicate operation which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has undertaken. He is going to impose one tax in order to repeal another tax. Now that is a most uncommon proceeding on the part of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is an operation which may possibly be justified, but it is one that is sure to draw upon it the severest and most jealous scrutiny. How will this new tax be borne? The tax he has proposed will fall upon persons spread through all classes. It will be felt in every portion of the community; and how unpopular will that tax become if, being one that is unpopular in itself, and under any circumstances there is connected with it that idea that the right hon. gentleman has an ulterior purpose—that he has lurking behind a purpose to turn that reduction of taxation which is shown to be so unproductive both to the consumer and to the revenue—to the compensation of the agriculturists. Well, a comparison has been made between

the proceedings of the present Government and those of Sir Robert Peel, and we were told last night by the right hon. Secretary for the Colonies<sup>1</sup> that the present Government were acting as nearly as possible upon the principles upon which Sir Robert Peel proceeded in the year 1842. Now the first difficulty which arose in my mind when I heard that declaration from a Minister of the Crown was this—Does it accord with the still more authentic declaration which has proceeded from the mouth of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the financial organ of the Government? Has the Chancellor of the Exchequer ever mentioned the name of Sir Robert Peel as his leader and guide in the measure he now proposes? Has he ever referred to that great statesman in terms which can give the slightest reason for believing that he recognizes any kindred between the measures of 1842 and those now before you? Certainly not. His announcement is flatly at variance with that of the Colonial Secretary. The right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, if I understood him rightly, that he never promised a revision of taxation. What he promised was this—that he was going to administer the finances of the country upon new principles, that were to do everybody good—principles that had never been heard of before. He said, addressing his constituents, “Do not suppose that when the new Parliament assembles you will see marshalled before you the old parties that have governed the country; you will have new principles of action introduced, and new policies founded on those principles, recommended to the House of Commons.” Are these principles then new, or are they old, or both new and old? The right hon. gentleman says they are new, the Home Secretary<sup>2</sup> says they are old. I do not know whether there are any hon. gentlemen in the House who can manage to hold with both. I cannot. I am, however, with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I think both that the principles themselves are new, and that the mode of carrying them into execution is new. I may presume to have an opinion on the question of what were Sir Robert Peel’s principles of commercial reform. Long associated with a recollection that will ever be dear to me, and sharing in the first struggles that he made for that great object, I must necessarily have had many opportunities of observing the workings of his mind upon the subject; and the whole House and the country have ample means of knowing by records of the time, if their memories do not enable them

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. S. Pakington.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.

to know, what his principles were. The principles on which his commercial reforms rested were—first, to set free the raw materials of industry from duty. How has the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer acted on that principle? There is still one raw material, and a most elementary raw material, that Sir Robert Peel, though he had the wish, never had the power, and the late Government, though they also had the wish, never had the power, to entirely free from duty—I mean timber. The repeal of that duty would have operated most beneficially for the shipping interest. But I have heard an hon. gentleman to-night say that because only 7*s.* 6*d.* a ton will be saved on one class of ships, and 2*s.* 6*d.* on another, the relief thus given would be insignificant in amount. Why, if the average reduction were only 5*s.* per ton, that would amount to £50 or £100 in the building of some classes of ships. But I wish to point out to the Committee that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a surplus of £1,500,000 one principle of Sir Robert Peel would have led him to consider whether there was any raw material in the tariff not set free from fiscal burdens. He has, as he says, examined the tariff most carefully, but strange to say he has passed by the article of timber. What was the next of Sir Robert Peel's principles? It was to remove or diminish duties, protective in their character, and especially those that fell upon articles of food. Are there no duties of that character still remaining in the tariff? Are there no duties on the importation of butter, or of cheese? But the right hon. gentleman has passed them by, and I might mention many other instances. He has passed by every one of them—he leaves them as he found them, and that is, in his view, acting on the principles of unrestricted competition. He certainly does not re-enact protective duties, but he stops at the point where he finds the work of reform, and declines to carry it on. The third of Sir Robert Peel's principles was to clear from the tariff unprotective and unnecessary duties, whose collection absorbed the whole, or the greater part of the produce. The right hon. gentleman has done nothing whatever in pursuance of this principle. The last principle of Sir Robert Peel was to reduce the price of highly-taxed articles of food. And, passing by every other point in the policy of Sir Robert Peel, on that and that alone has the Chancellor of the Exchequer chosen to bestow, not only his whole surplus, but a great deal more. Three of Sir Robert Peel's principles he has left entirely untouched, and

the fourth he has exaggerated by the course I have described. Does he in that, or does he not, offend against another principle of Sir Robert Peel? Whatever Sir Robert Peel did with respect to commercial reform, he did it always subject to the paramount obligation, of which he was conscious, to maintain the principle that ample sums should be raised in the year for the service of the year, and for the maintenance of a steady surplus of revenue above expenditure. He never allowed even his eagerness for commercial reform to make him deviate for one moment from the fundamental and yet more important view. All his operations were conducted subject to the control of that principle. It is the principle, as I shall presently show, that the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has disregarded and contemned. That is the case, as I conceive, of the commercial principles of Sir Robert Peel, and that is the relation of the Government to those commercial principles. But Sir Robert Peel, it is said, performed the operation which the right hon. gentleman is now preparing. He imposed a tax—the income tax—to repeal customs duties, a case precisely parallel to the course pursued by the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman is going to impose new taxes upon the householder; he increases taxes that have been paid already, and imposes them upon large classes that have not yet paid them, in order to repeal a portion of the malt tax. That is, I should say, he is going to impose a tax on the general body of the community, to make a most ineffectual and worthless attempt at the relief, not of a class, but of a portion of a class. This is precisely an inversion of the policy of Sir Robert Peel, for he imposed a tax on a class to relieve the entire body of the people. It was to you (*turning to the Ministerial benches*) that he made his appeal. You—the party opposite—are the men he called upon, as the possessors of property, to you he made his special appeal to accept the income tax, in order that that relief might be given to the springs of industry, and to the great consuming classes of the country. You answered that appeal, and I hope you will now maintain the character you then gained by the support you gave Sir Robert Peel, in the struggle for that great benefit which you enabled him to confer on his country. I proceed to another question which must not be omitted, for it is of vital importance, and lies right at the root of the whole discussion before us—I mean the question of the income tax. My right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies<sup>1</sup> is very much

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. S. Pakington.

mistaken if he thinks that in approaching that question, all he has to do is to set aside the particular objection that I have taken as regards the particular case of the fundholder, or to pass jokes at the expense of what he calls my ingenuity. The right hon. gentleman and the Government may depend upon it that they have opened a question of a most formidable character ; and in what position is it presented to us to-night ? I really thought, until the distinction that was made to-night, that we had a definite and intelligible plan presented to us. There is nothing that can excuse the Government, or acquit them of the heaviest responsibility to the country, if they open a question like that of rearranging the different contributions of all classes in the country to the income tax, unless the production of a plan which shall be intelligible—which may be subjected to scrutiny—which may be tried on its merits—and which will meet the view of the public as a plan, and not merely as an abstraction. If, on the other hand, a Government—because they know that amongst a large class of the community there is great favour entertained for a particular mode or principle of taxation—depart from the sound rule that binds them to submit their propositions, and to be responsible not merely for the general idea on which they are based, but for the means by which they will be carried into execution—if a Government thinks proper to appeal to favour for the support of their principle without confronting the difficulty of carrying it into effect, then I can only say that whatever others may do with regard to the financial policy of such a Government, I will be the firmest opponent of such a financial policy, because I know that such a course of pandering to the worst elements of popular feeling and the coarsest passions, must expose the country to the gravest dangers. We are told that it is necessary to moderate and check the progress of democracy ; but there is no surer way of advancing the progress of democracy than by casting loose on the world attractive and seductive schemes with regard to financial arrangements, which those who propose them know cannot be carried into effect. I shall explain in a few words the view and policy with which the income tax was first propounded ; and I may say, by way of preface, that the case of the fundholders is one of a score of cases with which hon. gentlemen will have to deal ; and I shall endeavour to show, when the proper time comes, that if you arrange the income tax in good faith as I understand it, that good faith will compel you to place the

fundholder at the lowest rate. Has the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer submitted to us a plan for the reconstruction of the income tax, or has he not? I say that a man who promises to vary the different rates of the income tax in different schedules, without having formed his plan for doing so, is guilty of a high offence against the public. I say that, because it appears from what was said by the right hon. gentleman to-night that the question is involved in almost hopeless obscurity. ("No, no!") Hon. gentlemen who did not hear the speech of the right hon. gentleman the Member for Portsmouth<sup>1</sup> may find it convenient to say "no"; but that right hon. gentleman tested the plan of the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he showed that the right hon. gentleman, who says he will distinguish between realized and precarious incomes, has, according to his Resolution, proceeded upon no principle whatever; and if I understood the answer of the right hon. gentleman, it was this, that not having had time to adjust the details of his plan, he had proposed the tax upon the basis of the old schedules without change; but if the right hon. gentleman has had no time to think about details, how was it he came to introduce exemptions with respect to clergymen? Is not that a point of detail? In the first place, as to the suggestion so pleasantly put by the right hon. gentleman that the Committee should affirm the Resolution, hon. Members should recollect that if we vote in Committee of Ways and Means that Resolution of his relating to the income tax, we shall be absolutely precluded by the forms and rules of the House from raising the full rate on certain income or property. Schedule D is now going to pay  $5\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.; and what is contained in Schedule D? The entire realized mercantile capital of the country—every farthing of it—is contained in Schedule D. The foreign fundholders in this country, unless they happen to have their dividends paid by an agent, are to be taxed  $5\frac{1}{4}d.$ ; but if the dividends are paid by an agent in the country, then they are to be taxed at  $7d.$  I may be met by being told that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has no idea of the amount of foreign funds and securities held in this country; but well-informed men in the City of London have told me that they do not amount to less than £80,000,000 or £100,000,000; not so great, certainly, in amount as the mercantile capital—that may be calculated by hundreds of millions—another of the

<sup>1</sup> Sir F. Baring.

exceptions with which we shall have to deal. It appears that the great finance Minister who is going to revise your system of taxation, and introduce new plans that will benefit every one and injure no one—who is going, above all, to reconstruct your income tax—asks you to pass a vote to put 5½*d.* on Schedule D, which will prevent you from putting the full tax on all this realized income, which he says himself ought to pay the full tax. The view of the income tax as first proposed was one that did honour to the great statesman who conceived it. It was undoubtedly required in part to meet a deficit, but it had also this ulterior and principal purpose—to effect a great and needful commercial reform; to lighten the springs of industry; to give activity to trade, and to cheapen commodities of all descriptions. My belief is, that Sir Robert Peel viewed the income tax as a temporary measure—(“Hear, hear!”)—by which I mean a measure that was to continue in force so long as the great reason that called it into existence was to continue in force. I mean a *bona fide* temporary measure, a temporary measure not limited absolutely to three or five years, but the number of years that would be required to effect completely a great system of commercial reform. That was the true basis of the income tax. The income tax is odious in the judgment of many gentlemen in this House, and I do not think it is an unreasonable sentiment; it is open to argument, but I do not pretend to say it is an unreasonable opinion. It may be thought to bear hardly on various classes of persons—on annuitants, on persons receiving salaries, and, above all, on persons in professions; and, in a secondary degree, on persons exercising trades—but surely that which brought the bane brought also in no small degree, the antidote. With a tax of 7*d.* on actual receipts, and as regarded land with a tax of 7*d.* or something more than actual receipts, commercial reforms were effected that made the receipts far larger than they ever had been before. And though persons receiving salaries, and engaged in professions, might at first sight undoubtedly object to paying the same rate as the possessors of property, I will ask, were not the articles which they consumed cut down in price, and did they not receive the benefit of that reduction? The right hon. gentleman very properly said, in speaking of the clerk, that there is no one who received so much advantage from the imposition of the income tax and the commercial reforms as he has done, because he is a consumer and is not a producer of any saleable commodities; but does not

the right hon. gentleman see that that applies to the whole class of persons receiving salaries? But though I say this, I do not deny that the question of the reconstruction of the income tax is open. All I say to the right hon. gentlemen is this, "Let us have a plan." I consider that the House of Commons will forfeit and forget its duty if it deals with this matter in the abstract. Instead of commanding the respect of the country, and making a provision for its permanent interest, it will become a mere panderer to public opinion, and be driven hither and thither by the force of it. What is the use of a Minister of the Crown rising in his place, and saying the time is come when we must recognize a difference between temporary and precarious incomes, and when challenged upon the absurdities and anomalies, inconsistencies and self-contradictions, of his plan, by a gentleman in this House, he says, "That is not my plan! I found it in the Schedules as they stand; but they are all to be reconstructed." I must say one word on a small interlude that took place, in vindication of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle,<sup>1</sup> whom the right hon. gentleman said, he would not say he greatly respected, but rather whom he greatly regarded.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that whatever might have escaped him in the haste of expression, he certainly had not intended to use the words in question in the sense in which they were applied by the right hon. gentleman.

MR. GLADSTONE: If it were a mere hasty word, of course I should be the last person to take notice of it; but an allusion has been made by my right hon. friend (Sir James Graham), in which I am part proprietor. I refer to the comparison which he drew between the position of a Bishop and a Judge. My right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies<sup>2</sup> denied the comparison, because he said a Judge could be removed from his office; and I now venture to say a Bishop may be deposed. If my right hon. friend pursues the case a little further he will see that the two cases approximate as closely as possible. I refer him to an Act that passed in 1843, under which a Bishop who is incapable may have the spiritualities of his diocese transferred to another ecclesiastic. I have asked the Governor of the Bank of England, who agrees in principle with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he will accept his plan, and he said it was impossible; for what does the right hon. gentleman do? The salient point of the whole case is on the public annuities, above

<sup>1</sup> Sir James Graham.

<sup>2</sup> Sir J. S. Pakington.

all annuities for years expiring in 1860. They were in the one case always chosen by common consent, to make visible, as it was thought, the uncertainty and inequality of the present law. The right hon. gentleman leaves this capital and crying grievance—so much a grievance, indeed, that it has always been made by common consent the standard-bearer to the rest, precisely where he found it. The annuitant is still included in Schedule C, and is still liable to 7*d.* in the pound on his interest and his capital. Now, the fact is, no two men have agreed upon a plan for getting rid of these difficulties. You appointed a Committee, which sat in 1851 and 1852, and examined witnesses. The Committee looked the question boldly in the face, and the consequence was they could not agree upon a plan. The hon. Member for Montrose<sup>1</sup> agreed upon a plan, but he agreed with whom? Why, he agreed with himself. My right hon. friend the Member for South Wiltshire<sup>2</sup> agreed upon a plan too, and he also agreed with himself. I did hope that at least some ten or twelve men in the Cabinet had agreed upon a concerted measure; but after what has passed this evening, I see that the Government, no more than anybody else, has got a plan. I have now endeavoured to deal manfully with this question. I say it behoved the Government to inquire into this subject, and see if they could not discover a plan which would be likely to satisfy the wishes of the community. I see at least no reason why they should announce that they intended to give effect to the principle before they had inquired whether effect could be given to it or not. It is bad enough when private Members of Parliament make flaunting promises to the community which they cannot perform; but it is far worse when a Government appointed to stop the progress of democracy, stoops to pursue a similar course, and endeavours to call upon a Conservative party to support them. Now I beg to touch on the last subject, I think, on which I shall trouble the Committee. I pass from the income tax with only this remark, which I commend to the serious consideration of hon. gentlemen—namely, that while I blame the conduct of the Government, I can make no complaint. I must say of the favourable reception which their proposition, if it may be so called, appears to have met with at the hands of the great bulk of their supporters. Those hon. gentlemen especially represent the landed interest in this House. They already pay the full rate of income tax, and they are now ready

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Joseph Hume.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Sidney Herbert.

to accede to the principle of the plan which will not only lead them to continue paying that full amount, but which will, through the operation of exemptions, throw on them a larger burden. But I wish to commend this point seriously to their consideration. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says it is time to recognize the distinction between permanent and precarious incomes. So far I am ready to follow him, saving always my right to support the case of the fundholder. I am ready to follow him into the examination of his plan. But the right hon. gentleman, and those who support him, should consider that there is another kind of gradation of which little or nothing has yet been said. It is no doubt true, that the medical man with his £300 a year is a poorer man, and a good deal more so, than he who has £300 in the funds. But is there not the yeoman of £50 a year, who cannot quite so well afford to pay 7*d.* in the pound, as the Duke of this or the Marquess of that, who, being like the yeoman in possession of landed property, differ from him in this, that while he possesses landed property of the value of £50 a year, they possess landed property worth £50,000 or £100,000? I hope hon. gentlemen will well consider whether they are prepared not only to distinguish between the land-owner and the professional man, but likewise to graduate between the holders of large and the holders of small properties. I come now to the question which is vital to the whole of this matter. Has the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I ask, included in his new scheme principles that involve the subversion of all those rules of prudence heretofore deemed necessary for the conduct of the financial affairs of this country? Has he, in other words, presented to the House a Budget without a surplus? I submit, without the slightest doubt, that he has presented a Budget without a surplus. (THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes, there is £400,000.) Well, if you hold to that, I will tell you how that matter stands. The case is really this: the Exchequer Loan Fund Commissioners have had two systems of administration. In one of those systems, which to a certain extent depended on each other, there was a discretionary power given, and if the accounts be accurate, there has been a considerable profit from the operations which have been conducted in the exercise of that discretion. Whilst, however, the Commission in the free exercise of its right arm had been making money for the public, it had been spending money faster than it made it by the compulsory exercise of its left arm. The right hon. gentleman has now for

the first time in detail told us plainly that the £400,000 which appear in the Ways and Means, and which constitute his sole surplus, are £400,000, not belonging to the services of the year, not drawn from the people by the service of the year, but repayments of money formerly obtained upon the credit of the country. The right hon. Baronet stated that the Government did not send its balances to the Bank because the Bank allowed no interest. The right hon. gentleman can hardly have considered the elementary terms between the Government and the Bank. It was true in the letter, but not in the spirit, that the Bank gave interest for the balances of the Government. But what does it matter whether you receive interest on your balances, or whether the Bank engages to transact your business, and lend you money when required at small rates of interest? When the Bank Charter comes to be granted, the directors will cast up their average balances, and will be regulated by their amount, as to the terms which they will give you for its renewal. A worthy Alderman<sup>1</sup> entered the other night into a defence of the Budget; but, oh, what a smash, what a cruel wreck and ruin, has that right hon. gentleman made of that defence this evening! The right hon. gentleman has, for the first time, in unmistakable terms, stated that his surplus consisted only of the repayment of money borrowed, or the creation of a debt; and the question the Committee has now to consider is, whether they will give their sanction to a financial scheme founded upon a surplus so obtained. The Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to vamp up a surplus out of borrowed money, and with that fictitious surplus he hoped to obtain the sanction of the Committee. I fully agree with the right hon. gentleman that the Committee in 1822 recommended that this fund should be devoted to "Ways and Means," in order to its being applied to the payment of the debt; but at that time there was a considerable surplus revenue. The same remark will apply to the recommendation of the Committee of 1828, also quoted by the right hon. gentleman. I am well satisfied with one or two of the explanations offered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I was pleased with what he said with respect to the Kafir war, and I cannot bring myself to criticize his intelligence too harshly. Let us cherish the illusion, if it be one, till, at all events, it is displaced by intelligence not open to dispute. I thank him also for his explanation respecting the malt tax for the years 1854 and 1855, though I

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Alderman Thompson.

think he has not allowed sufficient for the drawback, or for that reduction in the quantity of malt consumed by the brewers previous to the drawback. I think, however, that according to the right hon. gentleman's own showing, the loss in subsequent years upon the malt tax will be an enormous loss most slowly replaced. But I am not at all satisfied with his statement respecting the refining of sugar in bond. It will have the effect of increasing differential duties, and increasing the expense of collecting the revenue. In his statement with respect to the income tax there is a palpable hiatus in his figures, and upon adding them up the total falls short by nearly £140,000. The right hon. gentleman's surplus consists of the Exchequer Loan Fund; which is, in fact, a surplus of borrowed money, and it is clear, from the right hon. gentleman's statement of the revenue, that there is an actual deficiency. These are not times when we ought to trifle with the revenue. No economy is so good as that of maintaining the finances in a high state of credit. The right hon. gentleman has referred with triumph to the high price of the funds; but every one knows that the money market is, to a great extent, regulated by those who buy with the view of selling again immediately for profit, and not with a view to permanent investment. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has departed from the sound policy of supporting a surplus revenue, and no Minister will ever receive my support for his financial policy which proceeds upon such a system. It is a principle most dangerous, and most of all dangerous and inconsistent in a Conservative Government. The right hon. gentleman spoke of terminating the war of classes. Why, Sir, he has done more than any other man to revive and renew that war; and if I saw the hon. Member for the West Riding<sup>1</sup> in his place, who I know to be as strongly attached to the principle of establishing a difference in the income tax, I would make my appeal to him, and say, "That is your principle, and you are ready to adopt a reasonable plan for that purpose; but, I ask you, if you approve of a Government which, in submitting its plan, announces a popular principle, obtains a temporary harvest of popularity, and leaves the question of giving effect to its announcements to the chapter of accidents." I will ask hon. gentlemen who are so squeamish on the subject of anxiety for popularity, if they heard the speech of the right hon. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which he has laid out before the public the good deeds

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Richard Cobden.

of the Government, as a shopman lays out his wares? Many similar deeds have been done by former Governments, but they were never paraded before the House and country as they have been by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to-night; as though they were the carrying out of one of the "new principles" upon which we are hereafter to be governed. I hope that this country, if it has not been governed by enchanters and magicians, has at any rate been governed by men of sense and honour in former years; and I venture to say that no man who has held high office has not over and over again effected operations when the occasion required, of equal or greater importance, without parading them to the House in a speech on the Budget. When I speak of the right hon. gentleman renewing the war of class, I do not mean that he is reviving it on the question of protection; but I found my statement on the fact of his having launched opinions with respect to the reconstruction of the income tax, not supported by any executory means. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer closed his speech by stating that he was opposed by a coalition. What is the meaning of these charges of combination and coalition? and where is the evidence by which they are supported? Is it because the right hon. Baronet the Member for Halifax<sup>1</sup> opposes the Budget—and I likewise have the misfortune to do so—that there is therefore a factious combination between us? Does the evidence of factious combination depend upon concurrence in a vote? If so, why was not the complaint of combination raised about a fortnight ago, when we, from a sense of justice and duty, gave a vote not altogether inconvenient to the Government? And why is it, because we now conscientiously differ and dissent from the financial policy of the Government, that we are not to be free again to give an honest and independent vote? It seems to me that the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies<sup>2</sup> appears to think that they have a vested interest in the votes of hon. Members near me. I vote against the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, not only because I disapprove upon general grounds of the principles of that Budget, but emphatically and peculiarly because in my conscience—though it may be an erroneous belief—it is my firm conviction that the Budget is one, I will not say the most liberal, nor the most radical, but I will say the most subversive in its tendencies and ultimate effects which I have ever known submitted to this

<sup>1</sup> Sir C. Wood.

<sup>2</sup> Sir J. S. Pakington.

House. It is the most regardless of those general rules of prudence which it is absolutely necessary we should preserve, and which it is perfectly impossible that this House, as a popular assembly, should observe unless the Government sets us the example, and uses its influence to keep us in the right course. Sir, the House of Commons is a noble assembly, worthy of its historical and traditional associations; but it is too much to expect that we should teach the Executive its duty in elementary matters of administration and finance. If I vote against the Government, I vote in support of those Conservative principles which I thank God are common in a great degree to all parties in the British House of Commons, but of which I thought it was the peculiar pride and glory of the Conservative party to be the champions and the leaders. Are you not the party of 1842? Are you not the party who, in times of difficulty, chose to cover a deficit, and to provide a large surplus? And are you the same party to be united now in a time of prosperity, to convert a large surplus into a deficiency? I appeal to you by what you then were. I appeal to you to act now as you did then. Us you have cast off. I do not blame you for that. I am, indeed, always disposed to view with regret the rupture of party ties—my disposition is rather to retain them. I confess that I look, if not with suspicion, at least with disapprobation, on any one who is disposed to treat party connexions as matters of small importance. My opinion is that party ties closely appertain to those principles of confidence which we entertain for the House of Commons. But us you have cast off for inconsistency. Have we ever complained of that? Have we ever made it matter of charge against you? No, certainly not; you owe us no grudge on that account. But you must remember that you also have a character to maintain—that you also are on your trial—that you also are bound to look with suspicion on those principles of financial policy which depart from those rules that not only all statesmen, but the common sense of the country, agree to be essential to the prosperity of this nation. You are now asked to vote for a Budget which consecrates, as it were, the principle of a deficiency, and which endangers the public credit of the country, and which may peril our safety—if, indeed, the circumstances of the present day are circumstances of uneasiness; and if the Government have thought it right to call upon you for increased exertions in providing for the defences of the country, I say, then, that I vote against

this Budget in concert—at least in company—with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Halifax,<sup>1</sup> feeling that in giving that vote I do the work, so far as depends upon me, which you ought to join with me in doing. I do not express that sentiment in an offensive manner, but I say it because I feel deeply attached—having sat for so many years in this House, and having been connected during many of those years with public office, I feel profoundly attached—to the institutions of the country. I look back with regret upon the days when I sat nearer to many of my hon. friends opposite than I now am, and I feel it my duty to use that freedom of speech which I am sure, as Englishmen, you will tolerate, when I tell you that if you give your assent and your high authority to this most unsound and destructive principle on which the financial scheme of the Government is based—you may refuse my appeal now—you may accompany the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer into the lobby; but my belief is that the day will come when you will look back upon this vote—as its consequences sooner or later unfold themselves—you will look back upon this vote with bitter, but with late and ineffectual regret.

<sup>1</sup> Sir C. Wood.

## THE FIRST BUDGET

APRIL 18, 1853

Mr. Gladstone's first Budget, introduced in April, 1853, is a memorable epoch in the financial history of this country. He had become Chancellor of the Exchequer at the end of 1852 in the Government of Lord Aberdeen, composed in equal, or almost equal, proportions of Whigs and Peelites. The Budget provided, among other things, an elaborate scheme under which the Income Tax would have come to an end in 1860 after several stages of gradual reduction. Gladstone took the opportunity to review the history of the tax from the time when Pitt first proposed it in 1798 through its abandonment at the close of the French War in 1815 and its revival by Sir Robert Peel in 1842. No such searching analysis of national finance had been made by any Chancellor of the Exchequer for more than half a century, and it has often been compared with the great speech of Pitt fifty-five years before. Both deal with first principles, and discuss the general rules by which taxes should be levied. But Gladstone's speech has the advantage of dealing with the Income Tax from two points of view, as an anchor in time of war, and as a lever in time of peace. Pitt was concerned only to defend the justice and expediency of requiring a fair contribution from all property, from income rather than capital, towards the cost of conducting a great national struggle. Gladstone showed how Pitt's anticipations had been entirely justified by the result, and then turned to the equal though dissimilar success of Peel's attempt to effect by means of the Income Tax a general diminution of the burdens which an undue number of indirect taxes impose upon the community. The Budget of 1842 had, in fact, established free trade in almost everything except corn. But after 1846 there remained a considerable number of duties which, though not protective, hampered the operations of commerce, and seriously increased the cost of living to the working classes. Most of these duties were swept away by the Budget of 1853. The scope of this financial statement, however, is far wider than the particular proposals it embodies. Gladstone deals with the whole tenour and purport of national finance, comparing different forms of fiscal legislation and estimating their influence upon all classes of the people. It is this which constitutes the peculiar value, and the historical importance, of the speech. Gladstone also protested strongly in this speech against the policy of discriminating between permanent and precarious incomes for the purpose of taxing one more highly than the other. He did not, however, object so much to the principle of discrimination in itself as to the fact that it would relieve rich men engaged in business, or in professional work, at the expense of fund-holders or land-owners whose annual receipts were much smaller. He said nothing about the possibility of applying the principle of discrimination in favour of earned annuities only to comparatively slight amounts, so as to avoid the injustice necessarily involved in a universal scheme. The speech made a great difference in Gladstone's political position. It showed that he had the power of con-

structing a broad edifice of financial statesmanship which concerned directly the whole people of the United Kingdom. It is not too much to say that every succeeding Budget owes something to the principles expounded by Gladstone on this occasion. He dealt fully with the fundamental question how direct should be adjusted to indirect taxation, how all classes of the community should contribute their proper share, and no more, to the burden of national expenditure. At the same time he did not content himself with balancing the accounts of the year. He looked forwards as well as backwards, and estimated the probable revenue for several years ahead, though he could not provide for extraordinary outlay required by foreign war. In fact he exhausted the subject, so far as it was possible to do this with the facts then before him. He completed the work begun by Peel's Budget of 1842, and made the foundation of the taxes so broad and simple that it would easily bear their weight, while at the same time the plan of adjusting them was made, within practical limits, free from complexity of detail. There could be no better example of financial simplicity combined with financial strength. It carries out the principle of equal contribution from all classes, not indeed with reference to the exact position of individuals, but so that a fair average could be struck between different sections of the community in the apportionment of public burdens. From this point of view it is an invaluable guide to the financier, because it shows how the line should be drawn, and why the concentration of taxes on a few articles relieves the general consumer, and sets free the course of trade.

Apart altogether from the simplicity of taxation, and the principle of free trade, the Budget of 1853 will always be memorable for having made real as well as personal property liable to duty on succession. The financial result of removing the exemption which land had in this respect always enjoyed was not very great, far less than had been expected. But its social and economic effect was considerable. It took away a genuine and obvious grievance which ever since Pitt's days had been keenly felt. It showed that Parliament was no longer controlled by the landowning class, and that all forms of property would in the future contribute to the national revenue. Although the House of Lords made no attempt to interfere with the smooth progress of this Budget, it excited much discontent among country gentlemen and was represented as a cruel attempt to harass the inheritance of real estate by discouraging agricultural improvement. As a matter of fact, it was no serious hardship to any one, while it reconciled the owners of personal property to a burden which was no longer exclusive, and therefore was not regarded as unjust.

SIR, the annual exposition of the financial state and prospects of this country, even upon ordinary occasions, affords abundant material of interest to this House and to the country, and of anxiety to the person charged with the preparation of that exposition; but on the present occasion, perhaps that interest on the one hand, and certainly that anxiety on the other, are greatly enhanced by a variety of circumstances, including among them the number of separate Motions respecting taxes which have recently been made in this House, and which indicate the increasing eagerness of the people with respect to financial questions.

Political events, shocks which have enfeebled or overthrown

Administrations, and which have made it necessary to adjourn from year to year questions of taxation, have likewise greatly accumulated on the present Government the task they have to discharge in that department; and in connexion with those questions, there have of late been raised discussions of a nature most deeply interesting, descending to the first elementary principles of taxation, nay, almost to the first principles on which men are united in civilized society. With a task so formidable before me, I feel warranted in addressing a special appeal to the Committee for their kindness and indulgence; for I am certain that only by their kindness and indulgence can I be enabled—I will not say to discharge the task as it ought to be discharged, for that is wholly beyond my power—but to discharge it so as in any case to be at least intelligible to my hearers.

The first portion of my duty will be to lay before the Committee the state of the account of the country. I think I shall best discharge it, by taking up the state of that account from the point at which it stood last year, when the financial department was in the hands of the right hon. gentleman opposite;<sup>1</sup> and it will be satisfactory to the Committee to observe, that as our experience grows with the lapse of time, so do we obtain larger and still larger proof of the elasticity of the revenue, and of the progress of the productive and consuming powers of the country.

On the 30th of April, 1852, the right hon. gentleman opposite estimated the revenue for the financial year, which had then just commenced, at £51,625,000, and in the month of December 1852, when the right hon. gentleman had occasion to return to the subject, he was able to present to us an estimate which placed the revenue of the year at £52,325,000, exhibiting an increase upon his estimate in April amounting to not less than £700,000. And now, within the few months which have elapsed since last December, we have further evidence of the same gratifying character, for the revenue which the right hon. gentleman then judiciously estimated at £52,325,000, amounted to no less, when we reached the termination of the year on the 5th of April, than £53,089,000, showing an increase of £1,464,000 upon the estimate formed at the commencement of the year.

The expenditure of the last year, as estimated by the right hon. gentleman opposite on the 30th of April, 1852, was taken at £51,163,000, but the actual expenditure has only reached to £50,782,000; and consequently you have had figures presented

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

to you in the balance sheet which must have been gratifying to every member of the Committee, in showing a surplus of income over the expenditure for the year beginning April 6, 1852, and ending April 5, 1853, to the amount of £2,460,000.

But, Sir, having reached this point by a smooth and easy progress, it is now my duty to entreat hon. gentlemen to make large deductions from the very sanguine estimate which has been made in this House—so sanguine as, considering the quarters from which it came, to excite my surprise—that because our balance sheet for the past year shows £2,460,000 of surplus, therefore we have that sum available for remission of taxation. That would be a too precipitate inference. Unfortunately before we arrive at that conclusion, there is one circumstance rather material to examine, and this is, what is the estimated amount of expenditure for the year that we have just commenced?

Well, when I look to that, and compare it partly as it is estimated, but chiefly as it appears on the actual votes of this House, with the estimates of the last year, I find it stands as follows:—The expenditure for 1852–53 was £50,782,000, but the expenditure for 1853–54, the great bulk of which is already voted, and upon which I can anticipate, on the whole, no diminution, amounts to £52,183,000. Therefore, without going into other particulars, which, I am sorry to say, occasion a further deduction from the surplus of £2,460,000, I beg to point out that no less than £1,400,000, or nearly three-fifths of that surplus, are already disposed of by the charges to which you are liable under Acts of Parliament, by the votes to which the House has come for the defence of the country, and by the charges on account of the miscellaneous services, which, I apprehend, this House will not be inclined either to refuse or to diminish.

The right hon. gentleman opposite,<sup>1</sup> in December, 1852, estimated as follows his surplus for the present year:—He took a total sum of £1,600,000, of which, I think, he stated that, on the ordinary revenue, he would venture to anticipate a surplus amounting to between £1,300,000 and £1,400,000, and by decrease of charge for the Kafir war, a further sum of £200,000 or £300,000. These two sums put together gave a surplus, as the basis of his calculation for the year, amounting to £1,600,000. At that period, the right hon. gentleman thought that the only charge against that surplus on account of coming expenditure would be the sum of £100,000, which he proposed to apply to light-dues

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

and purposes connected with shipping, and £600,000 for the increase he anticipated on the great military services of the country. As regards the £100,000, the present Government have made arrangements which they hope will afford great relief to shipping, without any charge to the Exchequer ; but as regards the estimates for defence made by the right hon. gentleman, his successors in office have not been so fortunate ; nor have they, nor has the House, thought it wise to confine the votes for the year within these limits.

I shall now state to the House how that surplus of £1,600,000 has been swallowed up. The increase on the Navy estimates, including the packet service, as it was voted in 1852, and as we found it prepared for this year (making the comparison with the estimate of April, 1852, and not for my present purpose including the supplemental vote of December), amounts to £617,603.

The increase on the Army and Commissariat, but almost entirely on the Commissariat, is £90,000 ; and that increase on the Commissariat is to be accounted for by the fact that we have now reached, we trust, that stage in the hostilities at the Cape when we may consider our extraordinary votes at an end, and when the provision to be made has passed under the head of ordinary expenditure ; therefore, though it is our duty to submit to the House, during the present Session, an extraordinary vote for £200,000, which is essentially retrospective, we have likewise to submit a vote for £70,000 in Commissariat expenditure, which in its character is prospective, and analogous to our ordinary estimates. So that a double expenditure, as far as the Cape is concerned, is charged on the service of the present year.

The increase on the Ordnance is £616,000. The Militia estimates have not yet been brought to the shape in which they will be laid on the table ; but I am sorry to say that there will be a large, yet I believe an unavoidable, increase on the amount estimated last year by my right hon. friend then Secretary for the Home Department.<sup>1</sup> The estimate for the present year cannot, I fear, be expected to be much less, if at all less, than £530,000. I doubt if it was expected, twelve months ago, by my right hon. friend, that the amount would be more than something like £300,000. If this be so, there will be a considerable increase in the expense of giving effect to that plan ; and it is right that the House of Commons should know clearly the expense of giving effect to any plan, especially one which has realized, in other

<sup>1</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.

respects, all the most favourable anticipations formed of it. The increase of expense for the Militia, as compared with the reckoning of my right hon. friend, will, I apprehend, be about £230,000.

The last item in these augmentations of expense is the sum of £100,000, added to the votes during the present year for the purposes of public education. If the Committee take the pains to put together these five items, they will find that, though the right hon. gentleman opposite <sup>1</sup> anticipated a surplus of £1,600,000 for the financial year of 1853-54, the augmentations of charge, principally voted already and in part yet to come, amount to no less than £1,654,000.

However, as I have already stated to the Committee, there has been a further improvement in the revenue of the country, and there are likewise some few items of public expenditure on which the Government have been able to effect some small saving.

With respect to the important and unsatisfactory charge for the packet contract service, it has been our most anxious desire to see what, consistently with justice, was to be done to amend the position of the public. We think that the amount of charge which that service has reached is wholly disproportionate with the benefit derived.

I am not at present in a condition to lay the estimate on the table, or to state exactly what the estimate will be, but I venture to anticipate that at any rate, for the first year, we may be able to effect a saving on it of not less than £75,000. There will also be a saving on the charge for Exchequer bills, owing to the diminution of interest, amounting to about £65,000; and there will be a sum, which the House must observe is occasional in its nature, of £135,000, arising out of repayments to the Crown revenues, and available under the provisions of the law as ways and means, in consequence of a Bill lately passed by the House, which had reference to metropolitan improvements; and also there will be a sum available, through the liberation of the Crown revenues from a charge which heretofore affected them on the same account, to the extent of about £27,000. These various items will give a fund amounting to about £301,000.

I will now state more particularly to the Committee the items of anticipated revenue and expenditure of the country, from which they will see precisely the amount of the surplus we have to deal with. I should at the outset explain that I think it will be convenient that I should in all cases, disregarding minute

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

inaccuracies, give my estimate in round numbers. I will now present to the Committee an account of the estimated revenue and expenditure for the year 1853-54. With regard to the expenditure, the charge for the funded debt is put down at £27,500,000, and the charge for the unfunded debt at £304,000, making a total for the debt of £27,804,000. The charges on the Consolidated Fund will be £2,503,000; the Army estimates, £6,625,000; the Navy, £6,235,000, not including the packet service; the Ordnance estimates, £3,053,000; Miscellaneous, £4,476,000; Commissariat, £557,000; the Militia, as nearly as I can judge, £530,000; the extraordinary vote for the Kafir war, £200,000; and the packet service, I think, may be reasonably taken at £800,000 for the present year. These items give a total of estimated expenditure amounting to £52,183,000.

I now come to the estimate of anticipated revenue. I take the revenue of the Customs at £20,680,000; Excise, £14,640,000; Stamps, £6,700,000; Taxes, £3,250,000; and Income Tax, £5,550,000. From the Post Office we expect £900,000; and from the Crown lands, swelled by the addition I have already referred to, £390,000; from miscellaneous sources of receipt (including, I think, about £160,000, being the capital of the Merchant Seamen's Fund, out of which we shall have to pay £80,000 during the present year on account of pensions, and the whole of the remainder, I need not say, will be absorbed long before that charge for pensions ceases) we expect about £320,000; and from old stores £460,000. To these I venture to add, though the item is necessarily one of uncertainty and conjecture, that I anticipate a saving of not less than £100,000 from the operations which have been proposed to the House in connexion with the exchange and redemption of Stock. It may, certainly, be less, and it may, even on the other hand, be more—the final result, I hope, will show a considerably greater saving. I venture now to take credit for £100,000 on that account. Adding up, then, these various items, the Committee will find that they give a total estimated income for the year of £52,990,000, against which we have to set the total estimated expenditure of £52,183,000, showing an apparent surplus of £807,000.

Anxious, above all, to avoid raising undue expectations, I am desirous to impress on the Committee that it must bear in mind that out of this sum of £800,000, an amount of £215,000 consists of monies which do not proceed from permanent or recurring sources, but of monies available simply for the year,

and not to be repeated. Likewise, with the uncertainty connected with the item for the packet service and with that for the Channel Islands' harbours, on which my right hon. friend at the head of the Admiralty <sup>1</sup> and I are not quite sure whether we can or cannot venture to make a reduction in the sum printed in the estimates, it is possible that the surplus I have mentioned may fall short of being realized to the extent, perhaps, of £100,000. Therefore it will be more secure for the Committee to assume that the surplus, instead of £800,000, will be £700,000, and to bear in mind that £215,000 out of it consists of occasional payments. At the same time, while giving this explanation by way of caution, my sanguine hope is that we shall realize a surplus of £800,000.

This is the state of the account of the country, as I have endeavoured to bring it up to the present moment. The Committee will not have failed to observe that in reckoning the estimated income I have included a large sum, amounting to more than one-tenth of the whole revenue, which, from 1842 up to the present time, we have been deriving from the income tax. However, the income tax has at this moment legally expired, and it will be for the Committee to consider whether or not they shall revive it. Upon that subject I am afraid it will be my duty to trouble the Committee at some length; but before I venture on a detailed and continuous exposition of the views of the Government with respect to prospective finance, there are two incidental questions to which I shall briefly advert, on account chiefly of the position they occupied in the financial statement of my predecessor in the office I now have the honour to fill.

The first of these has reference to a particular class. Now, as regards the shipping interest, the House knows from a statement already made by my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade,<sup>2</sup> that Her Majesty's Government propose to afford what they trust will be found of considerable benefit and relief to that interest, without inflicting an annual charge upon the public.

But there was another interest mentioned by the right hon. gentleman opposite,<sup>3</sup> which has so much claim upon the general sympathies of the House, that respect and consideration demand that I should not leave it without mention; I mean that which is called the West Indian interest. With regard to that interest, I regret to say that there is indeed little, if anything, that can

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. Graham.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. E. Cardwell.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

be done by a Government, in our view, consistently with its more extended duties to the public, in fulfilment of the requisitions which that interest has preferred. With regard to a reduction of the duty on sugar, which is one of its requests, in proportion to the fall in the duty upon foreign sugar, so as to maintain the differential rate that now exists between them, it is entirely impossible for the Government to hold out the smallest hope that their recommendation can be adopted. With respect to the question of refining their sugar in bond, which is of a different character, my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury <sup>1</sup> will take a future occasion of entering more at large into that question ; but I regret to say that we have not discovered any method of granting that privilege in the present state of the law with respect to sugar, which would be satisfactory to the West Indians and to the refining trade, and which at the same time would not inflict very heavy loss upon the revenue. With respect to the equalization of the spirit duties, again, I fear that really nothing remains to be done in that respect. I believe the distillers of this country consider that already the duties have been somewhat more than equalized, all things considered, in the case of the West Indies. At all events, we are not prepared to propose any change in the law in the nature of equalization of spirit duties as between colonial and domestic produce.

There is but one way in which it has occurred to the Government that they might entertain a sanguine hope of being able, at very slight charge to this country, perhaps at no charge, to confer material benefit on the West Indies, and that is a way which, if it can be effected, will, I am sure, command the approbation of this House, because it is by enabling them to economize the heavy expenditure of their own governments—a heavy, and now in many cases almost a ruinous, expenditure. In the case of Jamaica, for example, there is a public debt, the minimum rate of interest upon which is 6 per cent., and the maximum 10 per cent., the capital of the debt amounting to about £500,000 ; and if it were possible for the Government to induce the Assembly of Jamaica to amend the vicious constitution of that island, and to place it upon a foundation that would give scope for a strict control over expenditure, Her Majesty's Government would then be disposed to recommend to this House to employ the credit of this country in the way of guarantee on behalf of

<sup>1</sup> Mr. J. Wilson.

the island of Jamaica. I do not now inquire whether that would entail a charge upon you ; I believe it would entail none. I should be the first to assert, that there should be the utmost jealousy as to the interposition of the credit of this country between debtors and creditors out of this country ; but, considering all that has happened to the West Indies, considering the effect that British legislation has had in precipitating their difficulties, I do believe that if we were able to point out a prospect of great and effectual relief to Jamaica, to be indirectly obtained through an effectual reform in its government, this House would look with a generous and a considerate eye upon any proposal for using the credit of this country in the manner that I have mentioned. What I have said refers to Jamaica, which presents at this moment by far the most urgent case of distress amongst the West India colonies ; I am not sure that there is any other among those colonies which would be in a condition to request a similar interposition ; if they did, it would depend upon the case they showed. I do not think it likely that such a case will arise ; all I mean to say at the present moment is, that the door would not be absolutely shut against them.

I pass on now from the collateral topic of the West Indian interest to another such topic—that connected with the Exchequer Loan Fund. After all that passed in debate in December last, it was evidently the duty of Her Majesty's Government to make a full investigation into the transactions of that Board. We have instituted that investigation ; we have presented the results in print to the House ; they are in form so simple, that an inspection occupying only a few minutes will exhibit them to any hon. Member. It appears from the figures there presented, that after debiting the Exchequer Loan Fund—I will not say with every folly of Parliament, but with every questionable or ambiguous grant that was made—after charging the whole of this to the last farthing, yet such has been the sound discretion exercised by the members and officers of that board in the loans they have made, that while they have afforded an immense amount of accommodation, they have likewise realized, after paying every expense that belongs to the office, a net balance of not less than £227,000, which balance, if we put values such as sanguine men might perhaps put upon certain investments that have not yet been realized, it is far from impossible may be raised to nearly £1,000,000 of money to the credit of the entire

transactions of the Board. It is our candid opinion, under these circumstances, that the favourable sentiments expressed by my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Admiralty,<sup>1</sup> in December last, in regard to the Exchequer Loan Fund, are justified by the facts, and it is not our intention to propose the abolition of that system, which we think has been both honourable to those who have administered it, and highly beneficial to the country.

I now approach a very difficult portion of the task that I have to perform—the discussion of the Income Tax. The first question that this Committee has to consider is, whether or not it will make efforts to part with the income tax at once. I do not say that such an alternative is impossible. On the contrary, I believe that by the conjunction of three measures, one of which must be a tax upon land, houses and other visible property, of perhaps 6*d.* in the pound; and another, a system of licenses upon trade made universal, and averaging something like 7*d.*; and the third, a change in your system of legacy duties, it would be possible for you at once to part with the income tax. But Her Majesty's Government do not recommend such a course to the Committee. They do not recommend it because they believe, in the first place, that such a system would, upon the whole, be far more unequal and cause greater dissatisfaction than the income tax; they believe, likewise, that it would arrest other beneficial reforms of taxation; and they believe that it would raise that difficult question in regard to the taxation of the public funds of this country in a form the most inconvenient. I might dilate upon this subject, but it is needless to do so. I leave it to those, if such there be, who are prepared to recommend the immediate abandonment of the income tax. Such is not the recommendation of Her Majesty's Government.

Now, in regard to the income tax, I wish that I could possess the Committee with the impression that constant study has made upon my own mind, of the deep and vital importance of the subject. We are too apt to measure the importance of the subject by the simple fact, that we draw from this tax £5,500,000 of revenue. Sir, that sum is a large one, but the mention of it conveys no idea to the Committee of the immense amount and magnitude of the question. If you want to appreciate the income tax you must go back to the epoch of its birth; you must consider what it has done for you, in times of national peril and emergency; you must consider what, if you do not destroy it

<sup>1</sup> Sir J. Graham.

—and I will explain afterwards what I mean by “destroy”—what it may do for you again, if it please God that those times shall return.

Sir, it was in the crisis of the revolutionary war that, when Mr. Pitt found the resources of taxation were failing under him, his mind fell back upon the conception of the income tax ; and, when he proposed it to Parliament, that great man, possessed with his great idea, raised his eloquence to an unusual height and power.

There is a description of the speech of Mr. Pitt on that occasion, written by a foreigner, a well-known writer of the day, Mallet du Pan, which I may venture to read to the Committee ; I believe, after the lapse of fifty-five years, it will be heard not wholly without interest. This is an account which, in a periodical that he edited, he gives of Mr. Pitt’s speech, in 1798—

“From the time that deliberate assemblies have existed, I doubt whether any man ever heard a display of this nature, equally astonishing for its extent, its precision, and the talents of its author. It is not a speech spoken by the Minister ; it is a complete course of public economy ; a work, and one of the finest works, upon practical and theoretical finance, that ever distinguished the pen of a philosopher and statesman. We may add this statement to the learned researches of such men as Adam Smith, Arthur Young, and Stuart, whom the Minister honoured with his quotations.”

I do not know whether this Committee are aware how much the country owes to the former income tax ; but, because I deem it to be of vital importance that you should fully appreciate the power of this colossal engine of finance, I will venture to place before you, in what I think an intelligible and striking form, the results which it once achieved. I will draw the comparison between the mode in which your burdens were met, during that period of the war when you had no income tax—during that period of the war when you had the income tax in a state of half-efficiency—and during that last and most arduous period of the war, when the income tax was in its full power.

From 1793 to 1798, a period of six years, there was no income tax ; from 1799 to 1802, there was an income tax ; but the provisions of the law made it far less effective, in proportion to its rate, than it now is ; and from 1806 to 1815, a period of eleven years, you had the income tax in its full force. Now, every one of us is aware of the enormous weight and enormous mischief that have been entailed upon this country by the accumulation of our debt ; but it is not too much to say, that it is

demonstrated by the figures, that our debt need not at this moment to have existed, if there had been the resolution to submit to the income tax at an earlier period. This test, I think you will admit, is a fair one ; I put together the whole charge of government and war, together with the charge of so much of the national debt as had accrued before 1793, so as to make (if I may so express myself) a fair start from 1793. The charge of government and war, together with the charge of debt incurred before 1793, amounted, on the average of the six years, down to 1798, to £36,030,000 a year : the revenue of that period, with all the additional taxes that were laid on, amounted to £20,626,000 a year ; there was, therefore, an annual excess of charge above revenue—charge for government, for war, and for debt contracted before 1793, but not including the charge of debt contracted since 1793—of no less than £15,404,000. In 1798 you just initiate the income tax, and immediately a change begins. In the four years, from 1799 to 1802, the charge for the same items that I have mentioned, which had been £36,000,000, rose to £47,413,000 a year ; but the revenue rose to £33,724,000 a year, and the excess for those four years was diminished by about £2,000,000 a year ; instead of an annual excess of £15,400,000 over revenue, it was £13,689,000. Now look to the operation of the tax, both direct and collateral, from 1806 to 1815, during the time when your exertions were greatest, and your charges were heaviest. The average annual expenses of war and government, from 1806 to 1815, together with the charge upon the debt contracted before 1793, were £65,794,000 ; but you had your income tax in its full force, with your whole financial system invigorated by its effects, and the revenue of the country now amounted to £63,790,000 ; while the deficiency in actual hard money, which during the war represented something like double the amount in debt, owing to the rate at which you borrowed, instead of being £15,404,000 a year, or (as it was in the second period) £13,689,000 a year, was only £2,004,000 a year, from 1806 to 1815.

Such was the power of the income tax. I have said there was a deficiency annually of £2,004,000, but it is fair for you to recollect, and it is necessary, in order to present to you the fact I want to place in clear view, that out of the £65,794,000 of charge that I have mentioned, about £9,500,000 were due for charge of debt contracted before 1793 ; so that, if you compare the actual expense of war from 1806 to 1815, with your revenue

when you had the income tax, it stands thus before you—that you actually raised £7,000,000 a year during that period, more than the charge of government, and the charge of war. That, I must say, is to me a most remarkable fact. It affords to me the proof, that if you do not destroy the efficacy of this engine—I do not raise now the question whether it is to be temporary or permanent, which I hold to be quite a different question, and I will go into that by and by—it affords you the means, should unhappily hostilities again break out, of at once raising your Army to 300,000 men, and your fleet to 100,000, with all your establishments in proportion. And—much as may be said of the importance—in which I concur—of an Army reserve and a Navy reserve, and of having your armouries and your arsenals well stored, I say this fiscal reserve is no less important ; for, if it be used aright, it is an engine to which you may resort, and with which, judiciously employed—if unhappily necessity arise, which may God in His mercy avert !—with it judiciously employed, you may again, if need be, defy the world.

This, then, is the purpose which the income tax has served—that in a time of vital struggle it enabled you to raise the income of the country above its expenditure of war and civil government, and that service so performed, was performed at a time when men do not minutely inquire into the incidents of taxation ; they do not then indulge themselves in the adjustment of details, but are afraid lest they should lose the mass and the substance. But times, when the hand of violence is let loose, and when whole plains are besmeared with carnage, are the times when it is desirable that you should have the power of resort to this mighty engine, to make it again available for the defence and the salvation of the country.

Well, Sir, the income tax dropped along with the purpose of the income tax, in 1816 ; but it was destined to be revived. Sir Robert Peel, in 1843, called forth from repose this giant, who had once shielded us in war, to come and assist our industrious toils in peace ; and if the first income tax produced enduring and memorable results, so I am free to say, at less expenditure by far in money, and without those painful accompaniments of havoc, war, and bloodshed—so has the second income tax. The second income tax has been the instrument by which you have introduced, and by which I hope ere long you may perfect, the reform, the effective reform, of your commercial and fiscal system ; and I, for one, am bold enough to hope, and to expect,

that in reforming your own fiscal and commercial system, you have laid the foundation of similar reforms—slow, perhaps, but certain in their progress—through every country of the civilized world. I say, therefore, Sir, that if we rightly use the income tax, when we part with it, we may look back upon it with some satisfaction, and may console ourselves for the annoyances it may have entailed by the recollection, that it has been the means of achieving a great good immediately to England, and ultimately to mankind.

Let me now attempt to present to the Committee a closer analysis of this impost. I shall assume that it is your view, as it is the view of the Government, that we cannot, at the present moment, with a due regard to the public interest, dispense with the income tax ; let us look a little into its composition. Let us attempt to investigate the charges which are alleged against it. I am not one of those who make light of those charges. In my own individual opinion it is perfectly plain, from the mode in which the income tax was put an end to at the termination of the war, that it is not well adapted for a permanent portion of your ordinary financial system. Whether it is so or not, on which there is a great difference of opinion, yet I think this is on all hands agreed, that it is not adapted for a permanent portion of your fiscal system, unless you can by reconstruction remove its inequalities. Even if you could remove its inequalities, a question into which we will patiently examine, there would still remain in my mind at least objections to it of the gravest character.

The reconstruction of your income tax would, I think, under any circumstances, be found to open up social questions of the most serious import ; and the machinery of the income tax, involving, as it necessarily does, to so large an extent, the objectionable principle of self-assessment, in my opinion, can never be satisfactory to the country. First, because self-assessment leads to grievous frauds upon the revenue, and renders the real inequality of the tax far greater than any of those among its inequalities which immediately strike the public eye and feelings ; and, secondly, because of the tendency to immorality, which is, I fear, essentially inherent in the nature of the operation.

But now let us examine the composition of the income tax. First, let me observe, that we are too much in the habit of speaking of this impost as merely a simple tax ; it is rather a code

or system of taxation. In mere bulk it is a volume ; it has been elaborated by many successive strokes in successive years ; it has accumulated a large mass of precedents for its application ; and, in short, it is a vast and complicated system of taxation, by which we succeed in raising, in round numbers, £5,600,000 a year. One-28th part of this sum is £200,000.

Now, if you investigate the composition of Schedule A, you will find that land and houses—which I take together, because their position is substantially analogous—including the incomes charged upon them in respect to mortgages and settlements, pay no less than 12-28ths of the tax, or about £2,400,000.

Now, let us look at the other great element of this tax—namely, the payment that proceeds from trades. In order to get at this payment accurately, we must descend a little deeper than the mere classification of the schedules. There are in Schedule A some considerable classes of property which pay duty along with land and houses, to the extent, I think, of something like £270,000 a year, yet which are essentially trading concerns. For the purpose which I have in view I must likewise take out of Schedule B the sum paid for the occupation of land, and place it along with trades, with which it is essentially analogous in character. This gives me £330,000 more, and then I come to what I may call trades proper—namely, those which appear in Schedule D, and which pay a sum of something like £1,200,000. These three branches of trades in Schedules A, B, and D contribute an income of no less than £1,000,000, or 9-28ths of the whole tax ; and the two together—that is to say, land and houses and trades—pay £4,200,000, or 21-28ths of the whole tax. There remain the funds in Schedule C, which pay £750,000, or 1-7th of the whole tax ; and salaries in Schedule E, which pay about 1-17th of the tax. Professions in Schedule D, after striking out those which partake rather of the character of trades, pay £250,000, or about 1-22nd of the tax. Thus we see the funds, salaries and professions make up the remaining fourth of the tax ; three-fourths being paid by land and houses, and by trades.

Now, it is said that gross inequality is the characteristic of the tax, and that it ought not to be levied—that it is unjust to levy it upon precarious and realized income alike. What income is precarious and what income is realized ? Income derived from trade would, I presume, be called precarious ; and, without wishing to anticipate the judgment of the Com-

mittee, I may probably assume that this is their opinion. Now, I beg the Committee to observe that, after all, the main question is between land and trade. Everything else, in respect of bulk and magnitude, forms but a mere outline and appendage to this, the main question. Land and houses, we find, pay an income tax of £2,400,000 and trade pays £1,800,000 ; between them they pay three-fourths of the whole tax. It is, therefore, evident that the justice of the present relations between land and trade must go a considerable way, I do not say the whole way, towards the solution of the great question whether the tax is, in the main, a just tax or not.

Let us look now at the case as it stands between land with houses on the one side and trade on the other, and, if the Committee will do me the favour to follow me in the estimate I am about to enter upon, it shall be my endeavour to place the matter before them in as clear a light as possible. My first object is to show the amount of tax really paid by land. When persons say that realized and precarious incomes ought not to pay the same rates, and that, therefore, the tax should be reconstructed, they forget to inquire whether at the present moment realized and precarious incomes as represented by land and houses on the one hand, and by trades on the other, do or do not pay the same rates. Let us, in the first place, see at what rate land and houses pay. Land pays in the gross 7*d.* in the pound upon an income not assessed by the possessors of the property, but by a standard independent of them ; and this sum is paid without even the smallest deduction in respect of the difference between gross and net income. It is obvious that, in order to estimate how much land and houses really pay, we must deduct the whole of the difference between the gross and the net income. Nay, we must do more than this, because the owners of land and houses are not the only persons beneficially interested in this description of property ; there remain behind a large body of mortgagers, encumbrancers, and liferenters, who, although they pay 7*d.* in the pound on their share of the proceeds of lands and houses, do not pay anything towards making up the difference between gross and net receipts.

In the Estimates I am about to submit to the Committee, I have been guided by inquiries which every member of it is as capable of making as I am. I can only say, that this Estimate has been framed in a spirit of moderation, and tested, as well as the case admitted, by reference to persons most familiar

with the subject. About £80,000,000, the gross income of land and houses, pay the tax. At 7*d.* in the pound, this gives, in round numbers, £2,333,000. What are the deductions which ought to be allowed for the difference between gross and net income—I will not say according to an arbitrary standard of equity—but if we should break up the present scheme and construct a new one, what should we be called on, and of course I must say, what would we in justice be compelled, to allow on this score? In Scotland, among the difference between gross and net income from lands, one class are known by the designation of “public burdens.” We have no analogous phrase in England; but we have heavy deductions, perhaps on the whole not less heavy than in Scotland, from gross rental. The first great item is the large charge for repairs, and under this head I include repairs for buildings, fences, and such drains as are not kept by the tenant. Repairs constitute a large charge upon land, but as regards houses it is still larger. You must allow for insurance; and also for law charges, without which it is impossible to conduct business connected with landed property and houses. You must allow—I will not say all the cost of management, but as much of it as you allow to a merchant under Schedule D—you must allow for clerks, sub-agents, ground-bailiffs, offices, stationery, receipts, and so forth. You must allow for arrears of rent, and you must likewise allow for what are called abatements of rent, which are a real deduction from income. How much shall we allow under these heads? What is the gross deduction we must make from the income of £80,000,000 supposed to be received by the owners of land and houses? I take it at 16 per cent. I do not think this an unfair estimate; I am certain that it is, in some instances, a very low one. If 16 per cent. be a fair deduction, it is evident we should reduce the £80,000,000 subjected to a tax of 7*d.* in the pound by the sum of £12,800,000, which is actually expended before the income reaches the pocket of the owner; and, therefore, we have arrived at this point, that we have got instead of £80,000,000 of income, only £67,200,000, and this reduced amount pays a tax amounting to £2,333,000.

Then I come to another question upon which I must again resort to conjectural estimate. What is a fair estimate to make of the total amount of charges on land and houses, all over the Kingdom, in respect not only of mortgages, but of settlements and all other arrangements of that kind? I estimate

that one-fourth part of the gross income derived from land and houses goes into the pockets, not of persons beneficially interested in them, properly speaking, but into those of mortgagees, annuitants, and others who receive under settlements. If that be so, then it appears that the owners of land and houses do not receive £67,200,000; but from that sum you must deduct the fourth part of £80,000,000, which reduces their income to £47,200,000. The sum of £47,200,000 is, then, the net receipt of those beneficially interested in land and houses. But you will justly say that the incumbrancers, who receive the £20,000,000, pay the income tax. Well, let us see what their quota amounts to. 7*d.* in the pound on £20,000,000 gives £583,000. Deduct this sum from the £2,333,000 paid by the owners of land and houses, and the sum of £1,750,000 will be left, and this is the amount actually paid on an income of £47,200,000. Now, if hon. Members will take the trouble to apply the figures I have stated, they will find the result to be this—that the sum of 9*d.* in the pound on a net income of £47,200,000 would amount to £1,732,500; and that, consequently, under the law as it now stands, the income derived from land and houses is taxed at the rate not of 7*d.* but 9*d.* in the pound. Then, what I want to know is this—supposing there be a *prima facie* case for breaking up the income tax on the ground of inequality between the two classes of payers—namely, the owners of land and houses and those engaged in trades, do you, on the whole, think that if a difference had to be made between the two classes, the difference ought to be greater than that which now exists? I do not raise the question whether there ought to be any difference whatever between the two classes, or whether the income of the year is not the just and proper object of a tax intended to provide for the services of the year; I pass that question by; but I show you that, according to a rational estimate, land at this moment pays 9*d.* and trade 7*d.* in the pound, and I ask any moderate man whether, if we were now about to establish a different rate of payment between the two classes, he would think of making the difference greater than exists at this moment?

In December last, the right hon. gentleman opposite proposed that realized income should pay a tax of 7*d.* and precarious income one of 5½*d.* Now, if any one will have the kindness to compare my figures with the right hon. gentleman's proposal, it will be found that, within a small fraction of a farthing, the

rates paid by the two classes of income are at present equivalent to  $7d.$  and  $5\frac{1}{2}d.$  If we break up the present income tax it must be for some object. If that object be to relieve trade at the expense of land and houses, it is well that those who may be about to sanction that purpose should consider where they are to begin in fixing the proportions of the payments to be made by different classes, and where they are to end. If it be desired to settle the question according to the views which have impressed themselves on the minds of many moderate and intelligent men, according to the view taken by the right hon. gentleman opposite, and by my hon. friend the Member for Wiltshire<sup>1</sup> in the Committee which sat upon this subject—namely, by making land pay about four, and precarious income about three, then I say that object is already accomplished, for the payments of the two classes bear that proportion to each other at this moment.

But let us go further in the consideration of this deeply important question. It is commonly stated that though we cannot do justice to each individual, we may do justice as between classes; and that for this purpose we must take an average of such class within itself. Now, I question the doctrine of those who propose to do justice between the various kinds of income by establishing averages for each class within itself. This is not the course advocated by the hon. Member for Montrose.<sup>2</sup> The hon. Member is always consistent, and always manful; when he sees a difficulty in his path he takes no pains to get out of the way. His instinctive sense of fairness and scorn of artifice leads him, in his attempts to reform the income tax, into difficulties which a man acting as a tactician would avoid. He says, fairly appraise the property or income of each individual. But the common notion is, that incomes should be classed in averages. In the name of reason and common sense, I ask how those who demand either equality, or an approach to it, can obtain it by averaging classes of income? Look at annuities. The tables give the value of female life at 15 years of age at 25 years' purchase; but go upwards to 70 or 75 years of age, and the value of the life is only 5 years' purchase: yet you propose to average, forsooth, these dissimilar cases—to bring up the value of 5 years' purchase and bring down the value of the 25 years' purchase to a common standard. What possible average can these interests admit of? A life of 25 years' purchase is five times the value of one of 5 years' purchase. Will

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sidney Herbert.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Joseph Hume.

it be any consolation to the life of 5 years' purchase, when called on to pay three times as much as he ought on the principles of the reformers of the tax to pay, that the life of 25 years' purchase pays only half as much as he should do? Still more absurd would be the attempt to average trades. Many trades are worth 25 years' purchase. I venture to say, that if the matter be closely investigated, it will be found that many trades are better, on the whole, than perpetuities, and for this reason, that trade affords opportunities for providing for children and relations such as no other pursuit presents. Let us, however, state the case moderately, and say that some trades are worth 25 years' purchase; there are others not worth more than 5, 4, or 3 years' purchase, and how are you to average the interest of a trade worth 3 and another worth 25 years' purchase? I must enter my protest against this averaging of classes as a mode of what is called doing justice in the matter of the income tax.

There is another topic of a somewhat painful nature connected with this branch of the subject, to which I must briefly allude. We have seen that land pays 7*d.* in the pound, according to a standard of value which does not depend on the will or testimony of its owner. Trade, on the other hand, pays 7*d.* in the pound, and this poundage assessed by each trader on himself. I have no doubt that in the majority of instances, the returns of our traders are fairly and honourably made. There are many cases, in trade, in which it is a matter of extreme difficulty to know what return to make, what really is chargeable as profit; and I believe that in not unfrequent cases the doubt is solved by the honourable trader against himself, and that he returns his profits greater than they really are. Let it not be supposed that I am going to impute to the trading classes of England generally the conduct which is pursued by some individuals. I am going to state an extreme case. It is an example, not of what has been generally done, but of what can be and has occasionally been done upon the scale I am going to show, and of what I fear on a smaller scale is often done. I will mention no names—I will violate no confidence—but I will state what happened in a great town where a new street was to be built. The persons who lived and carried on business in the old street, which was pulled down to make way for the new one, had been charged at a certain amount to the income tax. They had also, of course, made returns at a certain amount under the income tax. When the new street came to be built, they claimed com-

pensation for the loss of their business. The amount had to be assessed by a jury. Without wearying the Committee with details, I will state the amount of compensation which these persons—in number twenty-eight—claimed; the amount awarded them by the jury, which may be taken as, on the whole, an approximation to the real value; and the amount at which they returned their profits under the income tax. Were I to descend to individual cases, it would be almost impossible adequately to describe the partly ludicrous and partly shameful aspect which they assume. I will, therefore, deal with the matter generally, and say that twenty-eight persons in all claimed the sum of £48,159 as compensation for their profits for a single year. The amount of compensation awarded by the jury was £26,973, or a little more than half what was claimed. But what was the amount at which they had returned their profits for assessment to the income tax? They claimed £48,000; they got from the jury nearly £27,000; but the return of profits for the assessment to the income tax which they separately made had amounted only to £9,000.

I deeply regret that the great body of honourable men who have made the name of British commerce famous throughout the earth, less even for its energy than for its truthfulness, should be degraded by association with persons who could perpetuate frauds like these. But at the same time frauds of this kind, and in many other cases, do exist; they are inseparable from the character of the impost, human nature remaining as it is; and it is impossible, when you are called upon to consider the question of the readjustment of the tax, wholly to dismiss them from consideration.

Now, Sir, I leave this part of the question with the proposition—which I think will hardly be controverted—that as regards the state of the case between land and trade, reserving other cases for separate consideration, there is no sufficient ground to attempt the reconstruction of the income tax.

I have three other cases still to consider; and first I will take the case of Schedule E, which contains the payments that are derived from the incomes of the salaried servants of the public. I think that no class of persons is included in Schedule E, with the exception of persons connected with the Bank of England, who may not be called, in one sense or another, public servants. Some of them may be servants of local or separate authorities, as, for instance, of the East India Company; but

they are, I think, all public servants, and they are generally servants of Her Majesty's Government.

With respect to the case of these public salaries, I think it is scarcely possible to distinguish between such incomes and life incomes. As they are usually held almost for life, with retirements in prospect, their durability is little inferior to that of life incomes; and their inferiority, in respect of durability, is upon the whole compensated by this—that they are usually progressive incomes, while life incomes are usually fixed. It is impossible, I think, for any dispassionate man, under these circumstances, to draw a distinction between the case of salaries and that of life incomes, for the purpose of the income tax. With regard to remissions upon salaries, the case seems to be argued rather high both ways. At present there is a movement among the civil servants of the Crown for a change in regard to their superannuation funds, which would amount to an increase of salary. The tide has but lately turned, for it is not very long since the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire<sup>1</sup> made a Motion in this House—and, unless I am much mistaken, he all but carried it—for reducing salaries of this description wholesale by no less than 10 per cent. If the right hon. gentleman thinks that such salaries ought to be reduced by 10 per cent., I would suggest that it would be better to reduce them by a little less than 10 per cent., rather than break up the income tax on this account; in any case I think I shall carry general assent when I say it would be much better to deal with public salaries, if they are to be dealt with, by a separate arrangement, than to make them the occasion of an attempt to perform an operation on the income tax, which, up to this time, all those who have been responsible for our finances—if we except the right hon. gentleman opposite—have unanimously declared to be impossible and absurd.

Now, Sir, I come to what is supposed to be the sore place of the income tax, Schedule C; and when the Committee have heard what I have to say, I will fearlessly appeal to their love of justice, and put it to them whether Schedule C, even if it stood alone, is not rather a reason why they should not break up the income tax than why they should do so. I know this is a bold challenge; but wait and see whether I will not make good my position. In the first instance, I will read to the Committee a testimony that has come from across the Atlantic,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. J. W. Henley.

simply in order to impress upon them the conviction that when we approach Schedule C, we begin to tread upon very delicate ground. We wrote to the United States to ascertain what was done in that country, where taxes of this nature are levied, with respect to the public stocks or funds, and I have here a short letter signed by Mr. Everett dated "Department of State, Washington, 10th of February, 1853," in which he says—

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 9th inst., inquiring, by direction of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the public debt of the United States is subject to property or income tax in the hands of those who hold the stock, and also whether in the Acts authorizing the contracting of the debts, any provision was made, exempting them from taxation ?

"In reply, I have the honour to inform you, that there is nothing in the constitution of the United States, or in the laws creating the public debt, which prohibits this Government from levying a tax on that debt ; the Governments of the respective States, however, can levy no such tax, as this would be an act impairing the obligation of a contract, which is expressly forbidden by the federal constitution."

It appears to me, upon a fair review of the case, that we must set out with this doctrine admitted on all hands : that we are bound to give some rational construction to those words in the Loan Acts which provide that the public dividends shall be paid free of all taxes and charges whatever. I think we are bound to give them a rational construction. Mr. Pitt thought the rational construction to give to them was, that you should not look at all to the nature of the source, but that you should consider the dividends simply in relation to the receiver as so much income. I am bound to say that I think Mr. Pitt's construction of the pledge was the safest and the wisest. It has, at any rate, been acted upon for more than fifty years, and under it the great bulk of the public debt has either been borrowed or reborrowed. I do not mean now to dwell upon the difficulties you might have in the case of these Acts in proceeding at this time to impose a new construction of the contract, after a former one has so long prevailed ; but what I do beg you to acknowledge is, that there is only one other construction, in any sense rational, that could be given to the words in the Loan Acts, and it is this : that we are entitled to look, if we choose, not at the mere amount of annual income, but at the durability of the income, as tested by the price of the income when it is sold. I will suppose, then, the proposition now is, that we should reconstruct the income tax, in order that we may levy the tax upon something like what is called the capitalized value of the income.

Considering the circumstances under which the income tax was first imposed, and the circumstances under which that change is now suggested, I never can believe that it would be adopted by a British Parliament. Observe not only the effect which it would have upon the interest of the fundholders, but, above all, the light in which it exhibits the dealings of the State with them. When Mr. Pitt imposed the income tax, he said to those persons, "We have nothing to do with capitalized value or with price in the market; we can look to nothing but what you receive from year to year." At that time, when the fundholder was taxed upon his income from year to year, what was the capitalized value of his income? About sixteen years' purchase. That was not far from the average capitalized value of the fundholders' income for seventeen years of the income tax, until the conclusion of peace. Suppose your new doctrines had been in vogue then, the fundholder would have paid only one-half of what he did pay; and shall I be told that, after adopting a construction most unfavourable at the moment to the fundholder, and after taxing him, and taxing him, too, at the rate of 10 per cent. on the full value of his income for seventeen years, when he could only have got sixteen years' purchase for his property in the market, England and the English Parliament will now turn round upon that man, in the manner suggested, when, owing mainly to the general confidence in your strict good faith towards the public creditor, the value of his property has risen to thirty-three years' purchase? If you now determine that the capitalized value of the fundholders' income ought to be taxed, I say that you inflict the grossest wrong upon him in time of war. When he then consented to pay 10 per cent. upon the value of his income, he had confidence that peace would be restored, that his income would become more valuable, that faith would be observed with him—I mean faith according to the common principles of equity and justice—and that no advantage would be taken of that rise in value. But if the British Parliament sets the example of establishing in time of war, when funds are low, the doctrine that you have nothing to do with capitalized income, and then in time of peace, when the funds are high, sets up the opposite doctrine; I will not merely say that the character of this nation will not stand as in the time of your fathers it has stood, but I warn you that you must abandon, from henceforth, the idea of taking the lead among all the borrowers of the world, and that you must

prepare for a vital change in your relations with those who have hitherto trusted you.

There are persons who say, "We ought to tax incomes at different rates, accordingly as they proceed from property or from skill." In fact, they would place industrious incomes on the one side, and lazy incomes on the other. Now, in my opinion, a great deal may be said in favour of that doctrine; but observe the effect it must have with regard to the public creditor. The landholder must exert himself with respect to his land, the householder as to his house, and the mortgagee must either look out himself, or pay his lawyer for looking out, to ascertain the safety of the investment proposed for his money; and I do not believe there is any income which is perfectly and entirely a lazy income, except the income of the fundholder.

If that were so, the fundholder would enjoy an entire pre-eminence in taxation, and the degree of that pre-eminence it would rest with you to fix. I honour the sense of justice of my hon. friend the Member for Montrose,<sup>1</sup> and so I honour the sense of justice of those gentlemen (the actuaries) who have recommended the fundamental reconstruction of this tax, and who do fairly adopt and abide by the durability of incomes. If they had made their proposals in 1798, I do not know that the fundholders would have had much reason to complain; but, on the contrary, I believe that, upon the whole, they would have been gainers. I think, however, that the proposal of the actuaries is unsound in principle. I conceive that it is unsound in principle to levy the revenue of the country, in substance, by a tax upon its property, for I think that income is, in the main, the proper basis of taxation. I do not mean, however, to push that doctrine to extremes: and I undoubtedly should say, if we have a property tax at all in substitution for the income tax, let us have a good and honest property tax, such as the actuaries propose. Unfortunately, these gentlemen have the plan which they recommend entirely to themselves, for no one has ever been found to propose it in this House, or, as far as I know, elsewhere. In fact, nobody will propose that plan, for every one knows it is a mathematical speculation upon paper, but not a project to be submitted to an assembly of men whose bounden duty it is to provide by practicable means for the constantly recurring wants and services of the country.

The project of the actuaries, then, I pass by, because, while

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Joseph Hume.

it is of all the plans of income-tax reform the most self-consistent, it is also, I will not say the most impossible (for that would be a solecism), but it is placed the furthest beyond the reach even of imagination as a possible measure.

Now, I will request the Committee to go yet further with me into the consideration of one more point with regard to the funds, which I take to be highly practical in its character, and which I beg to commend to their particular attention. I have used every means in my power to analyze the manner in which the funds are held. It is, however, a matter of great difficulty. In old times there was a very general belief in the appearance of hobgoblins, and now throughout the country you may here and there find those who have a somewhat analogous conception of an awful being they call the fundholder, whom they picture to their imaginations as an iron-hearted creature, rolling in wealth, and living in worthless indolence upon the toil and sweat of his countrymen; but it is very difficult to find out whether the existence of this monster is a fact or a fiction.

I cannot obtain a complete analysis of the manner in which the funds are held. The State, as we know, has no information upon the subject. The Bank of England, which pays the dividends, knows only one circumstance, and that is whether the dividend is paid to a joint account or a sole account. Now, a very remarkable change has been taking place of late years in the manner in which the funds are held. About fifteen years ago, the funds were chiefly held in sole accounts by individuals, and I think you may, upon the whole, take it nearly for granted that the sole accounts indicate—but I speak in the presence of practical authorities, who can correct me if I mislead you—absolute property, with some few exceptions. So lately, then, as fifteen years ago, much more than one-half of the stocks were held in sole accounts, and, therefore, represented absolute property; but mark the change that has taken place. At present the case is reversed. The whole amount of stock held in sole accounts is at the present moment £280,000,000, and out of that amount £60,000,000 represents the incomes of persons who are exempt from the income tax by reason of their incomes being under £150 a year. There is, therefore, a sum of about £220,000,000 held by persons who may be considered as holding perpetuities in the funds, and whom the reformers of the income tax would regard as entitled to the distinction of pre-eminent taxation under that tax. Now, the amount held in joint accounts

was, in February, 1852, £427,000,000, and I have no doubt that it is at this time much more. One-third of the funds, upon the whole, are held in sole accounts and two-thirds in joint accounts.

Now, what do these joint accounts mean? I will tell you very nearly what they mean. These joint accounts may be divided, I believe, into five classes, one or other of which may be taken as comprehending very nearly the whole. In the first place, the joint accounts include a large class of charities, and among them I reckon the great account of the Commissioners of the National Debt for Savings Banks, amounting to £33,000,000. These sums are all by law exempt from income tax. Then, in the second place, we have the Chancery and Bankruptcy Accounts, amounting to between £50,000,000 and £60,000,000. I don't imagine that it is the desire of this Committee, or of the reformers of the income tax, to lay upon the monies locked up in Chancery and Bankruptcy an exceptional tax. A third class which enters into the joint accounts is made up of those cases in which English firms—particularly banking firms, but other firms also—hold large sums of money on account of foreigners. I imagine that, although Englishmen who have investments in the funds more commonly hold them in their own names, it is very common for foreigners to have stock held in the names of their banking or mercantile correspondents.

It has been a popular doctrine to tax the foreigner, but I think that no person in this House would wish to tax the foreigner in this particular form. It has been a long-contested question with respect to income tax in England, whether the foreigner is not entitled to exemption altogether. The late Sir Robert Peel subjected him to equal taxation in 1842; but even that proposal was strongly resisted, and I think every Member of this House will agree that it would be very impolitic to lay an exceptional tax of this kind upon the foreigner.

The fourth class interested in joint accounts, and a very large class too, is the class indicated by life interests less than perpetuity. When Mr. Horsman made a proposal with reference to the income tax in 1848, one of his main arguments was founded on the absurdity of taxing life interests at the same rate at which perpetuities are taxed. Of late the income tax reformers have had much less compassion for the life-interest men, and few of them have seemed to regard their case at all. My opinion is, that if the income tax were reconstructed, it would be very difficult to shut out the class having life interests from the benefit

of a reduced rate, if you introduce the distinction of rate ; but surely it would be intolerable to raise the tax upon the funds as far as regards that large portion of holders who have a mere life interest.

The fifth class interested in joint accounts consists of trading companies and associations holding funded property. Now, are you to lay an exceptional tax upon the capital of persons so engaged in trade ? I should say that it is very much better to leave English trade where it is, paying 7*d.* in the pound, in the place of the 9*d.* paid by land and houses, and with the power of investing money in the funds when it is convenient for purposes of banking, or for other trades, without the fear of exceptional taxation, than to break up the whole system, and scone the trader in Schedule C, that you may reimburse him by exceptions in Schedule D. Thus then, Sir, the strongest case urged for the reconstruction of the tax is the case of Schedule C ; but in Schedule C, against £220,000,000 held by persons in their own right, you have £430,000,000 not held by persons in their own right as mere individual property, and when you have established your exceptional tax against the funds, your very next step must be to exempt the whole of this £430,000,000 not held by persons in their own right as mere individual property, and when you have established your exceptional tax against the funds, your very next step must be to exempt the whole of this £430,000,000. Well, Sir, that is the sum of what I have to say upon Schedule C.

<sup>21</sup><sub>21</sub> I shall now touch very briefly upon the remaining case of Schedule D—that is to say of Schedule D as respects the professions. I have made it my business, Sir, to ascertain what proportion of the whole payment under Schedule D proceeds from professional persons, and I have found that, including certain amphibious classes, it is about £300,000, or rather more than one-twentieth part of the whole income tax ; but there are several persons who are returned as professional persons who, for the purpose of a new classification of the income tax, must be considered as traders, such as auctioneers, house agents, and army agents. The country surgeon frequently combines with his profession the trade and capital of a druggist and apothecary. Solicitors, again, in many places are, to no small extent, considerable capitalists ; their capital is invested in their trade, and the income tax must be paid upon it as it would upon capital invested in any other trade. Taking these mixed cases out, the net sum that may be said to be paid by the professions is

about £250,000, which is about one-twenty-second part of the whole income tax.

I do not at all deny that the case of professional men appeals to our sympathies. In my opinion it is one of the reasons which indicates that the tax ought to be a temporary tax ; but I hope the Committee will pause before it rushes to the conclusion that upon account of the case of professional men—for I think I have in some degree disposed of the other cases—they will proceed to such a labour—I will not call it an Herculean labour, because an Herculean labour means a labour that Hercules could accomplish, and this I am persuaded he could not ;—but to such a labour as that of breaking up and reconstructing the income tax.

It would be a pity to find yourselves compelled to break up the income tax on account of those whose case is so limited in comparison to the whole range of the tax that they only pay one-twenty-second part of the amount. But then you may say, “ Why not exempt them altogether ; if they form so limited a part of the whole body of taxpayers, why not give them a favour ? ” And there is a great deal in point of feeling to recommend that course ; but there is a great deal in point of feeling to recommend many things in this world of ours, upon examination of which you find insuperable obstacles in the way of your giving scope to that feeling.

I will tell you why you cannot exempt professional incomes without breaking up the scheme of the tax. In the first place, there are the auctioneers, house agents, farm agents, and others I have referred to, now nestling within the class of professions, and whom you would have to dislodge from that class, but with each of whom there would be considerable difficulty if there were an attempt to exclude them from benefits to which persons in the position of professional men were to be entitled.

Again, you would have great difficulty in knowing what to do with the clergy. Your feeling would tend with equal force both ways. You would think it extremely offensive to reconstruct the income tax on behalf of professional men, and yet to make the clergyman with £150 or £200 a year pay the higher rate. But if you let him into the favoured category, I am not so sure that you would be pleased to extend the same favour to the dean and the bishop. You would find extreme difficulty there ; but there are other and more serious difficulties than these.

Many persons holding salaried offices—not public servants

—now charged in Schedule D, have certainly a much worse tenure and an inferior interest in their incomes than professional men. Above all, there is what I warned you of in respect to averaging the supposed value of the income of classes. A large class of retail dealers have an interest in their trades much inferior to that of professional men. Their shops and trades and businesses change hands much quicker. They are creatures of to-day, gone to-morrow; and professional men as a class, putting aside the exceptional case of sickness, are permanence itself compared with a certain and a very numerous portion of the smaller class of traders.

I must warn the Committee, likewise, that they will find the greatest difficulty when they come to consider, in the midst of this process of breaking up the income tax, the case of the life annuitants. Let me for a moment put it to you who these people are. Professional persons, at all events, are men, are beings charged by the Almighty with the care of wives and children, and generally endowed with a capacity to discharge that duty. But when you come to life annuitants, you then deal with the desolate widow, with the orphan daughter; with defenceless women, whose right it is to expect at your hands justice, tenderness, and protection. Are their incomes precarious, or are they not? I will take some lady who has been bred in the lap of luxury, and who then upon the death of her parent finds herself with the interest of £5,000 or £6,000 to live upon for the remainder of her days. I want to know whether that income is or is not to be subjected to the higher tax as an income from realized property? And will you then tell me that upon the daughter and the widow you will lay that exceptional tax, and yet talk of doing justice, because you put the higher tax upon her in order that you may put the lower tax upon your bankers and brewers, and upon your physicians and lawyers? I make my appeal to you as men upon this point. I am convinced, whether the views of the present Government be right or wrong, whether our propositions meet your approbation or whether they do not, that you never will consent to draw that distinction in favour of the great and energetic commerce of this country, and against the pittances on which the great portion of these women must subsist.

Sir, the unparalleled indulgence of the Committee has brought me nearly to the close of this portion of the subject, and there is but one more point in connexion with it to which I need refer,

It is commonly supposed that it is either some crotchet of an individual, or the general laziness and inattention of official persons to their duties, that prevents them giving effect to the wishes which many gentlemen laudably entertain, to see these inequalities of the income tax, which I do not deny, removed by a reconstruction. But I will point out the kind of difficulty in which you find yourselves involved when you set about that work ; for I can truly and fairly say—and I think if I do not command credit for it as an individual, yet that the characters of my colleagues will demand full credit for them—I can truly and fairly say, that it has been our most earnest desire, if we could with justice have attained that object, to consult the public feeling in regard to the proposition which we might have to make about the income tax.

We have, therefore, studiously and laboriously turned over the question again and again and have put it, I believe, in every light in which it is capable of being viewed. And now I will just give you a specimen of the way in which, when you set about a reconstruction of this tax, you find yourselves involved. I will suppose that, if the income tax be differentiated, you will extend the favour to what are called the terminable annuities. The terminable annuities expire in 1860, and they have always been thought to afford the most favourable case—the case commonly selected for argument by way of illustration—for those who wish to break up the income tax. Of course, they will get the benefits of it. They are worth so many years' purchase, and no more, and you can tell exactly how much of the annuity in each case represents interest, and how much capital. You commence, then, by exempting the terminable annuitants. Is that all ? By no means. What do you do with Government life annuitants ? Must you not exempt them also ? Is not their case substantially the same with the others ? A man lays out money on an annuity for his life. Although the term of his life is uncertain, such an annuity has just as fixed a price in London as an annuity of the expiry of which you fix the date. On the same principle, therefore, you must exempt the Government life annuitants, as you have done to the terminable annuitants. But, if you do that, you cannot think of anything so monstrous as taxing interests for life, or for a term perhaps less than life upon leasehold properties. How will you be able to tax a man who has, suppose, a lease on which he has paid a heavy fine, and of which there is a term of five or ten years unexpired ?

The great bulk of the interest in the property is not his, but the landlord's, the reversioner's, and you must evidently give to the holder of such a lease, therefore, a share of the proposed exemption. Then I must again remind you of the class holding life interests in the funds. You can't draw a distinction between life interests in the funds and life interests in leaseholds. They must help to swell the goodly company of exemptions. After them come those who hold jointures and other annuities upon land. Certainly, a life annuity in the funds is one thing, and a life annuity upon land is another ; but the life interest of the individual is alike in both cases. When you have got those in, what do you do with life-renters, with the possessors of entailed estates, to which the successor may be a second cousin, living in the East Indies, whom his predecessors may never have seen and in whom he has no interest ? This may, I fear, be tedious to the Committee, but these are practical questions, all of which must be faced, if we are to reform the income tax. I do not say that there are no distinctions between these different parties. There are distinctions between each of them. But what I say is this, that when you come to define those distinctions, and to try to make them the broad ground upon which you take your stand, and say, "Here you will be exempt—there you will pay the exceptional tax," there is not one of the classes I have mentioned with respect to which you will find it possible to fix it as the limit of the intended operation.

The real tendency of all these exemptions, however, is the breaking up and destruction of the tax. I do not say the "relinquishment," because relinquishment is one thing, and breaking up is another. Relinquish it for a time, and when emergencies arrive you may do as your fathers did—take down the weapon from the shelf, and make it serve you again for the ends of honour and of duty. To relinquish it is altogether safe, because it is altogether honourable. But to break it up is to encourage the House of Commons to venture upon schemes which may look well on paper, and may serve the purpose of the moment, but which will end in the destruction of the tax by the absurdities and by the iniquities which they involve. Sir, if that is to be done, it must be done by those whose consciences enable them to take a different view from ours of the character and of the destiny of this great country. It will not be done by us, by men who believe, that although you may enter upon that fatal and seductive path, it will lead you into quagmire, will throw the

whole finance of the empire into confusion, and will deprive you of that ready and effective resource to which hitherto you have been able in all times to look as an effectual resort open to you in circumstances of difficulty and trouble.

Sir, the general views of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the income tax are, that it is an engine of gigantic power for great national purposes, but at the same time that there are circumstances attending its operation which make it difficult, perhaps impossible, at any rate in our opinion not desirable, to maintain it as a portion of the permanent and ordinary finances of the country. The public feeling of its inequality is a fact most important in itself. The inquisition it entails is a most serious disadvantage. And the frauds to which it leads are an evil which it is not possible to characterize in terms too strong.

One thing I hope this House will never do, and that is, nibble at this great public question. Don't let them adopt the plan of reconstructing the income tax to-day, and saying, "If that does not work well, we'll try our hands at it again to-morrow." That is not the way in which the relations of classes brought into the nicest competition one with another under a scheme of direct taxation, are to be treated. Depend upon it, when you come to close quarters with this subject, when you come to measure and test the respective relations of intelligence and labour and property in all their myriad and complex forms, and when you come to represent those relations in arithmetical results, you are undertaking an operation of which I should say it was beyond the power of man to conduct it with satisfaction, but, at any rate, it is an operation to which you ought not constantly to recur; for if, as my noble friend once said, with universal applause, this country cannot bear a revolution once a year, I will venture to say that it cannot bear a reconstruction of the income tax once a year.

Whatever you do in regard to the income tax, you must be bold, you must be intelligible, you must be decisive. You must not palter with it. If you do, I have striven at least to point out as well as my feeble powers will permit, the almost desecration I would say, certainly the gross breach of duty to your country, of which you will be guilty, in thus putting to hazard one of the most potent and effective among all its material resources. I believe it to be of vital importance, whether you keep this tax or whether you part with it, that you either should

keep it, or should leave it in a state in which it will be fit for service on an emergency, and that it will be impossible to do if you break up the basis of your income tax.

Then you will ask me, "On what principle do you mean to proceed?—you have made an argument, so far as you have gone, to show that the tax cannot be reconstructed and cannot be amended; what will you do with it?"

What we wish to do, and what we shall aim at doing by the measure which I shall propose, is this:—We wish, in the first place, to put an end to the uncertainty respecting the income tax. We think it unfortunate that political circumstances have for the last two or three years led to a state of doubt in regard to the continuance of the tax, and have even begotten by degrees a feeling on the part of the public that the public is about to be entrapped unawares into its perpetuation. My belief is, that much of the uneasy feeling that prevails is traceable to that source, and I am very far from thinking that our merely asking of the Committee to renew this tax for a given term, in lieu of asking you to make it perpetual, would be sufficient to allay that anxiety or to remove that doubt.

There is a certain class of transactions with regard to which the uncertainty about the income tax operates most unfavourably—such as the terminable annuities for example. It is very desirable that certainty should be restored on account of these transactions, and also on grounds more enlarged and general.

I think it also most desirable that effectual measures should be taken to mark this tax as a temporary tax. By this I do not mean merely, or chiefly, that I would commit the Government to an abstract opinion to be acted upon in future years. My own opinion is decidedly against the perpetuity of the tax as a permanent ordinary portion of our finances. But while I state the wish of the Government to propose it as a temporary tax, I do not ask you to rely on their words to bind them or yourselves, irrespectively of what may occur in the interim, as to what you will do under all circumstances at the expiration of the term which we propose to fix for its continuance now. I propose by positive enactment, by the measures which I shall invite you to adopt, to lay the ground for placing Parliament in such a position that at a given period it may, if it think fit, part with that tax.

Besides fixing on the tax a temporary character, we are most anxious to do what can be done, in order to meet the public

feeling as to the inequality of the tax. For that public feeling we have not only respect, but sympathy, while we do not admit that it is our duty, as persons charged with the conduct of public affairs, to shape our measures according to any feeling or sentiment whatever, until we have examined the practical form which they are to take, and tried it by the light of our understanding. We propose, Sir, to introduce certain mitigations into the operation of the income tax. We propose to extend the principle of commutations, which is now applicable only to trades, to professions also. A more important mitigation which we propose to make is this: There is a general feeling that a man ought to have, at any rate, the opportunity of investing the savings he may make from his income without being liable to the income tax upon them. We do not think it possible to make provisions of that kind applicable to savings simply as such. All we can do is to say "If you choose to invest your savings in the form of a deferred annuity or a life assurance, the premium which you may pay upon the deferred annuity or life assurance up to one-seventh of your income, shall not be chargeable to your income tax, but may be deducted from your income tax before it is charged." I am not at all prepared to say that we would stop at that point if it were possible to do more. At the same time, this plan has considerable recommendations. I do not say that it will completely meet the case of persons who, being afflicted with sickness, cannot, except under peculiar circumstances, insure their lives, because, unfortunately, cases of that sort it is beyond the power of the Legislature to meet. But what I do say is this—that it is a relief which will admit of very extensive application. I cannot reckon that the reduction from the receipts of the tax in consequence of it will be less—though, of course, this is a matter of uncertainty—when we look to the total amount of life assurance in this country, than £120,000 a year. It establishes, however, no invidious distinctions between one class and another. It is open to all those who choose to avail themselves of it; but while it is open to them all, we know that practically the classes who are in the habit of insuring their lives are just those very classes whom it is your main object to relieve by the reconstruction of the tax—namely, the classes of professional men and of persons who are dependent upon their own exertions.

I think it will be necessary, in conjunction with the proposal I have just named, to propose that Government should itself

become insurers of life. If it is to undertake that charge, as will probably be the case, it will insure lives on the same principles as those on which it is now a vendor of life annuities.

But while I say that our object is to meet the public feeling as to the inequality of the tax, and while I specify these modes of going some way to effect that object, I have more to lay before you upon this subject. And pray understand me. Do not let me through my neglect be misapprehended, or fail to state clearly the position of the Government. What we understand to be the sentiment of the country, and what we ourselves, as a matter of feeling, are disposed to defer to, and to share in, is, that the income tax bears upon the whole too hard upon intelligence and skill, and not hard enough upon property as compared with intelligence and skill. This, I say, is the sentiment which, with whatever varieties of form, has been expressed through various organs, and has awakened an echo in the public mind. I hope that I here state with accuracy, not as yet the precise measures that we propose, but the object which the reconstructors of the income tax have in view. Well, if that be their object—if they think that at present skill and intelligence are too severely pressed, and that property under the income tax pays too little, let me remind them that they must not form their judgment of the condition of classes from one single tax or from another single tax, but that they must look to the general effect of the whole system of taxation. And all I implore of them is, that they will reserve their decision upon the question whether the Government proposition sufficiently meets the case of skill and intelligence as compared with property until they have heard me throughout, if their kindness will permit them still to extend to me their patience.

Our proposition, then, in regard to the income tax is this:—We propose to renew it for two years from April, 1853, at the rate of *7d.* in the pound. The Committee will recollect that I said we thought it our duty to look the whole breadth of this difficulty in the face—not to endeavour to escape it, not to endeavour to attenuate, or to understate it, but to face and to settle, if the Committee would enable us, the whole question of the income tax. We propose then to re-enact it for two years, from April, 1853, to April, 1855, at the rate of *7d.* in the pound. From April, 1855, to enact it for two more years at *6d.* in the pound; and then, for three more years—I cannot wonder at the smile which I perceive that my words provoke—for three

more years—from April, 1857, at 5*d.* Under this proposal, on the 5th of April, 1860, the income tax will expire.

Sir, we think it far better—far more in accordance with our own obligations, and far more likely to advance the interests of the country—that we should present to you what we think—and I will tell you why we think so by and by—a real substantive plan, under which the income tax may, if Parliament should think fit, be got rid of, than that we should come to you with some paltry proposal to shirk the difficulty by re-enacting it for one year, and thereby prolonging the public uncertainty and dissatisfaction, and giving rise not only to doubts as to the position of the tax, but even as to the perfect good faith of Parliament in its mode of dealing with the country. Now, Sir, we think that the descending rates which we have embodied in the proposal for the renewal of the tax will tend to show to Parliament and to the country that our intention to part with it, or, at all events, our intention to put Parliament in 1860 in a condition to part with it, is a real and a *bona fide* intention.

But you will say—and say justly—that that intention does not of itself put Parliament in a condition to part with the tax,—that it is very well to say that it shall, for two years, remain at 7*d.* in the pound,—that for two years more it shall be 6*d.*, and for three years more 5*d.*; but that when it comes to 5*d.* you may find that there is still a deficiency, and that you again want the 7*d.*, or that when you come to the end of the period with the rate of 5*d.* in the pound, you may find you cannot part with it. With respect to this objection I have to say, that before the close of my present statement I shall endeavour to give you full satisfaction on that point; and I will further venture to say that, whatever you may think of the plan I have to propose, no gentleman in the Committee shall leave his place to-night with the opinion that the Government are paltering with the House of Commons, or that I am not presenting a proposal which is at any rate substantive and intelligible.

I say, Sir, that our principles, with respect to the income tax (which is the corner-stone of our whole financial plan)—our principles with respect to the income tax required of us these things:—In the first place, to mark it effectually as a temporary tax; in the second place, to meet, in a way which we think good and effectual, the public feeling with respect to the inequality of the tax; and I will very shortly explain how we mean to attain this end. But, beyond this, I wish to ask—and this is

the important question to which I seek to draw the attention of Parliament—if you determine to renew the income tax, will you make its early extinction your first and sole object, or will you, in order to bring to completion the noble work of commercial reform which is so far advanced, once more associate the income tax with a remission of duties, extensive in itself and beneficial to the community? We have considered fully these two alternatives; and we have decided deliberately in favour of the second.

While we propose to renew the income tax, we propose to associate it during the years which it has still to run with a great and beneficial remission of taxes. But the statement which I have already made with respect to the surplus, is one not altogether promising in this respect. He would be an ingenious Minister of Finance who should found an extensive remission of taxation or a surplus of £800,000, £200,000, or £300,000 of which he regards as accidental or uncertain. If we are to propose a remission of taxes, we must have funds out of which to make the remission. This is, of course, an elementary truth, but I am sorry to say that it is not wholly needless to impress it upon the House.

We have, therefore, to consider—and this, Sir, is the most invidious of all the portions of my task, upon which I am now about to enter—we have now to consider what are the means open to us, in consistency with justice, for creating a fund which, in conjunction with our present surplus, we can apply to an extensive and beneficial remission of taxes.

Now, the first question which is raised is this—if the income tax is to be continued, shall it also be extended? And the view of the Government is this—that the late Administration were right in stating that, if the income tax was to be continued, the exemptions under it should be narrowly considered; and therefore we are prepared to deal with the question of these exemptions.

What, in the first place, let me ask, is the case of persons enjoying incomes immediately below £150 per annum? There may be those who say that it is dangerous to attempt to levy the income tax on incomes below £150; but it is my opinion that the safety of that measure depends in a great degree—I may say mainly—on its justice; and if you can show that it is required by justice to other classes, and that it would be advantageous to the country, and even to the parties themselves who

would be immediately affected by it, I am not afraid, with the confidence I entertain in the character of the English people, that there would be any danger attaching to such a measure. There were apprehensions, we know, entertained in 1842 that the imposition of the income tax in any shape would be found unpopular ; but the sense of justice and enlightened prudence of the people, appreciating as they did the great benefit achieved by its instrumentality, divested it, if not of the unpopularity, certainly of the odious character which it was thought might generally have attached to it.

Well, now, what is the case of persons enjoying incomes under £150 ? It is well known that persons of that class have very largely benefited by the measures consequent on the income tax up to the present time. Twelve millions of taxes have been remitted, and they have enjoyed their full share of this, without the charge of one farthing. I don't propose that we should carry the tax down to the regions where it would trench on labour. To my view it is a right and expedient principle—taking it in connexion with all the circumstances of the case—that we should not trench upon what I would call the territory of labour. That territory will probably be defined sufficiently for my purpose by the figure of £100 a year ; and what I am saying now has reference to the case of incomes between £100 and £150. Their case is, that they have enjoyed up to the present time the full benefit of the remission of the £12,000,000 of taxes to which I have referred. But that is not all. If we were going to continue the income tax for a short period without any compensating advantage, then, indeed, it might not be expedient that I should ask you to extend it to a lower amount than at present ; but I am going, before I conclude, to ask you to support the Government in enacting a great and beneficial remission of taxes ; and I say, before you confer that great additional benefit, let us consider how far the results of our plan can be distributed equitably among the various classes of the community.

I will present to the Committee what I think they will consider some interesting results with respect to the past operation of our recent legislative remissions. With a view to the decision of the question which I am now opening, it appeared to me a matter of extreme interest to collect a number of *bona fide* cases of the distribution of the expenditure of particular families receiving different rates of income, marking the proportion in which they had each profited by the adoption of the income

tax, and the measures connected with it. My right hon. friend the head of the Poor Law Board<sup>1</sup> kindly lent me his able and effective aid, and I have thus been enabled to collect a body of trustworthy information of the kind which I am now about to present to the Committee.

I shall not trouble you with the details, but merely give the general results of a few *bona fide* cases of actual expenditure, and I believe they are fair average cases, which will exhibit the actual savings which have been realized by persons whose incomes are below £150, and also by those whose incomes are above £150, in consequence of the adoption of the income tax, and of the remission of taxes, and the changes in our commercial system which were brought about through its medium. But it should be recollected that, in estimating the savings, I have taken credit for the further remissions which I am about to propose as well as for those which have already taken place.

I have collected six cases of incomes varying from £175 to £400 a year; and, after taking credit at moderate rates for the principal part of their savings, and carefully setting down the various items which go to make up their incomes, I find that their gross incomes amount to £1,359, and their gross savings to £63 1s. 3d., making a gain of above 5 per cent. upon the gross amount of their incomes; and even if you deduct the income tax which they have paid, there will still remain a saving of £22 16s. 6½d., or nearly 2 per cent. upon their incomes. This, I think, is not an unsatisfactory result which I have presented to the Committee.

But I have likewise got four cases of the actual expenditure of persons with incomes between £100 and £150, and these, the Committee should understand, are not cases which have been selected for the purpose of arriving at a particular result, but are cases which have been fairly and honestly collected for the purpose of showing the actual distribution of expenditure of the two classes to which I have referred. One is the case of a country tradesman with £120 per annum; the second is the case of a retired Liverpool tradesman (having six children) with £120 per annum; the third is the case of a widow in the country, with an income from £120 to £150 (say £135 per annum); and the fourth is the case of a clerk in a country town, with £100 per annum; making a total income of £475, and their gain has been £29 6s. 11d., or between 6 and 7 per cent. Deducting income tax

<sup>1</sup> Mr. M. T. Baines.

at the rate of 5*d.* in the pound, the savings would amount to £19 9*s.*, or more than 4 per cent. So that you see clearly from this that the persons with incomes between £100 and £150 have apparently profited by the changes in our legislation to a considerably greater extent than those with incomes above £150.

I ought to say that in estimating the savings I have endeavoured to keep strictly within the bounds of moderation, and that I have no doubt that the results could easily have been swelled if I had chosen. No, Sir, it appears to us that these facts offer a rather strong reason for considering whether, when we propose to renew the income tax in the case of persons with incomes above £150, it is not demanded by justice that we should expect that persons with incomes below £150 should, to some reasonable extent, become sharers in the burden. Her Majesty's Government think that in justice we ought to make this demand upon them.

What we propose is this—we propose so far to complicate the tax as to introduce a provision that incomes between £100 and £150 shall be liable at the rate of 5*d.* in the pound for the whole time during which the tax is levied, so that, for the first two years, incomes above £150 will pay 7*d.* in the pound, and incomes below £150, 5*d.*; for the next two years, the one will pay 6*d.* and the other 5*d.*, and for the following three years both classes will alike pay at the rate of 5*d.* in the pound. I estimate that this tax of 5*d.* on incomes from £100 to £150 will produce £250,000; but as it will not be levied till the latter half of the current financial year, the sum of £125,000 only will come to credit in the financial year of 1853–54.

I now come to another great exemption—the exemption of Ireland. Ireland, in like manner, has received the benefit of the income tax through the changes in our fiscal system, but at the same time the equivalent which was intended to be taken has not been exacted. That equivalent was twofold. In the first place, it consisted of a duty upon spirits of 1*s.* a gallon, which was abandoned almost as soon as it was enacted. In the second place, it consisted of an augmentation of the stamp duties—which augmentation was indeed levied for some years; but in 1850, my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Control<sup>1</sup> made a great reduction in the stamp duties both of this country and of Ireland, and in that reduction disappeared the increase which was enacted in Ireland as an equivalent for the income tax,

<sup>1</sup> Sir C. Wood.

I am not able to speak with absolute precision, but as nearly as we can make out, it would appear that the rate at which Ireland now pays stamp duties on her transactions is as nearly as possible, on an average, the same as it was in 1842.

It is, indeed, true that since the first enactment of the income tax, Ireland has been visited with an awful calamity, and although that scourge has been mercifully withdrawn, yet traces of it still remain in many social and economical forms, and especially in the form of a very heavy and burdensome debt. That debt is but a fraction, indeed, of the generous aid accorded by the Imperial Parliament to the necessities of Ireland; but at the same time it cannot be denied that it is a very heavy and enduring burden, not on Ireland generally, but on its most distressed parts. Those, however, who look at Ireland cannot avoid being struck by the fact that all Ireland is not alike—that there are certain districts that do not need to shrink from their full taxation—and which have no reasonable claim or plea to offer for exemption.

Let me remind the Committee what exemption means. It does not mean that we have got a bottomless purse, and that we can dispense exemptions to one man without injuring another; no, Sir, the exemption of one man means the extra taxation of another—and the exemption of one country means the extra taxation of another. And as this applies to changes in the income tax generally, so it applies to Ireland relatively to England.

What we think, therefore, is, that the case of Ireland demands very special consideration in connexion with the burdens that have been imposed on her, with respect to which I will say more by and by, as a sequel or corollary to the present branch of my subject; but, in the meantime, I have to say that we see no reason why the income tax should not be levied on Ireland, as she, through the income tax which Great Britain has borne, has received a great portion of the benefit attending the remission of taxes up to the present time, and is likely, also, to profit largely by the remissions I have to propose to the House. The produce of the income tax, which will be laid on Ireland under precisely the same conditions and for the same term as in England and Scotland—the produce of the income tax in Ireland I estimate at £460,000 a year; but as the tax will not be levied till some time after October next, there will be only £230,000 to come to credit in the financial year 1853-54.

I will now give the Committee an account of the manner in which my estimate stands, as a whole, with respect to the income

tax. The estimated produce of the tax, supposing there be no change in the existing system, is £5,550,000. Deduct life assurances (£120,000), of which one-half only comes to charge this year, namely, £60,000, there will be left £5,490,000. The extension below £150 we reckon at £125,000; and the extension to Ireland at £230,000; making the total for the year 1853-54, according to the proposed plan, £5,845,000.

I now come to another proposal for the augmentation of taxation, to which I invite the special attention of the Committee. It is one of great importance. It involves both economical and social considerations of the highest nature. I have stated to the Committee that we propose to enlarge our means by new taxation with a view to further beneficial changes in our fiscal system. That is one object we have in view. Another object is—and it is likewise an important object—to meet the public feeling, which we recognize and share, that the operation of the income tax is severe upon intelligence and skill as compared with property. I frankly own my total inability to meet the feeling which has been excited upon the subject of the income tax, by any attempt to vary the rate of the tax according to the source of the income; and that I think I should be guilty of a high political offence if I attempted it. But let me now point out to you that if you think that intelligence and skill under our system of taxation pay too much, and property too little, there are means of equalizing the burdens of the two classes, in a manner which would be on the whole, safe, honourable and efficacious.

Sir, I refer to the question of the legacy duty—a question which it is perfectly plain cannot long be withheld from the consideration of the House. In my opinion it is a question of which the earliest settlement will likewise be the best. It requires settlement. The tax is not just as it stands. And how is it unjust? I frankly confess that I have always thought that the view of the case, as stated by the hon. Member for Lambeth<sup>1</sup> who has exerted himself most effectively on this subject—I have always thought that his view, if I may say so without offence, was a most inadequate view of the case. The tax is supposed to favour landed property, which I do not deny; but it also favours property which has not that claim to favour which landed property and household property might perhaps fairly urge as a ground of exemption from taxation. I am glad to hear the hon. Member echoing that sentiment. I wish to set aside the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. A. Williams.

impression that the question bears on its front the odious aspect of a question of class. It does no such thing. We propose to alter it, and, subject to conditions which I will state, to extend the legacy duty to all successions whatever.

With respect to the probate duty, at the present moment we do not venture to deal with it. The probate duty itself, I grant you, calls for reform, and if the Government had the means of carrying into effect that reform in the present year, it would have been satisfactory to have done so. As it is, we are obliged at present to postpone it, but we hope that in a future and early year it will come under consideration. It is said that the legacy duty is in the nature of a tax upon property. It is a tax upon property, and because it is a tax upon property it meets the views which have been so much favoured by a large portion of this House and by public opinion—namely, that if the income tax is to bear unequally upon intelligence and skill as compared with property, then that inequality ought to be redressed in some way or other. I think this is a safe mode in which to redress that inequality, and if this is a tax upon property it is divested of the danger that attends the taxation of property generally.

The greatest mischief of taxes upon property is the liability of a constant recurrence of those struggles of classes which are often associated with them. But in carrying into effect this increase in the legacy duty, you have this great advantage, that the liability to pay occurs only within the limitation which the laws of a higher Power have ordained ; that it only occurs once, on the death of a man ; and that no man can die more than once. I may be wrong, but I assure the Committee that it appears to me that this is a most weighty consideration for those whose duty it is to inquire how they can best neutralize the social dangers incident to all questions connected with the taxation of property. Upon the whole, the question may thus be stated. The present adjustment of this duty cannot be maintained. You find the principle of this tax recognized in our law ; you find its operation so limited by the very conditions under which it exists that there is little reason to apprehend the disturbing of a fair settlement of these duties, if once made ; and you will, I think, be of opinion that this is a fair and right tax to adopt for itself, and that it is one which in other respects meets, in the best, safest, and most effective manner, the feeling which is, I know, prevalent in this House—that the present operation of the income tax is severe upon intelligence and skill as compared with property.

I propose to retain the present scale of consanguinity with one change. (An HON. MEMBER: "Oh!") We cannot go into that matter now, because the emotion of the hon. Member might produce a duellum between him and me that would inconveniently cross the course of my general statement, and we must adjourn the consideration of the subject to another time.

We propose then, Sir, to retain the present scale, but with one mitigation. Under that scale, relations of affinity are treated as strangers—a son-in-law and a daughter-in-law pay a duty of 10 per cent. We propose to place them on the footing of relations by blood. We propose that the exemption of real property should no longer exist, subject to the conditions I am about to mention. The Government propose that the exemption of settled personality should no longer exist, and as we abolish the exemption, I now come to the question—a most grave one for the Government to consider, and one which they have carefully considered—would it be just that all descriptions of property, personalty and real property, should be charged at the same rate of duty to the legacy duty? Our opinion is that it ought not, and we think that a distinction ought to be taken, but not taken exactly in the same manner as heretofore.

It is obvious, when we regard the burdens upon property in this country, that there is a great mass of taxation that attaches to property which may be roughly called—I do not know whether the term is capable of a strict legal construction, but it will best convey my meaning—rateable property, which includes, along with real property, a great amount of leasehold, copyhold, and so forth, which is not real property, but which is subject to the burdens of real property; which is subject to taxation by the income tax, which is subject to the land tax, though, as a whole, in a somewhat less degree than land itself, which is subject to the extra charges on the transfer of property, and which is subject generally to all the charges that affect visible property as contrasted with invisible property and especially which is liable to the great weight of local taxation. There is, between these items, a sum of £14,000,000 or £15,000,000 of taxes in the three kingdoms laid entirely on rateable property, to which not real property only, not land only, but leasehold and copyhold property also are subjected. This property is now struck in both ways; it is subject to the legacy and probate duties, and it is also subject to all the burdens incident to real property.

The Government propose to amend the whole foundation of

the law, by striking a new distinction, and by saying that whatever exemption or partial advantage shall be given to real property shall be given in conjunction with it to other property which is now subjected to similar special burdens. We propose, therefore, totally to abolish, for the purpose of legacy duty or succession tax, the effect of settlement, so that the person who succeeds to personal property will pay according to his interest. He will pay upon capital, if he succeeds to the capital; and if he succeeds to a lesser interest, he will pay on the value of that lesser interest. The Government, then, thinking it just that a less amount shall be taken from rateable property than from property that does not pay these special burdens, have to ask in what way that distinction can best be struck. It has long been the policy of this country—the result, it may be, of measures accidentally taken, but not on that account the less beneficial—that visible and rateable property should be principally taxed in the form of an annual charge. Now, it would be obviously highly inconsistent, while we leave such property subject to its heavy annual burdens, to aggravate them by laying a heavy charge upon capital. For the Government would then force and accelerate, by the pressure of fiscal enactments, changes in the tenure of this property; and that acceleration would be, in my opinion, not only unjust, but most cruel and mischievous in a social point of view.

We think that if anything in the nature of a distinction is taken in the legacy duties in favour of rateable property as against the other descriptions of property, the fairest mode in the case of an estate would be found to be this—that the successor to real and rateable property should be in all cases taxed upon the life interest only, or on a minor interest, if he has only a minor interest. It is difficult for me to enter upon a full discussion of all the reasons that have led us to that conclusion. The question is very much connected with the great difficulty of any attempt to ascertain the capital values of real property. As a matter of fact, under the social arrangements of this country, our great estates are settled estates. Leaving this subject, however, for future discussion, it is our opinion that our proposal ought to include the legacy duties, but that some remission ought to be granted to property, which is now subject to a great weight of peculiar and exceptional taxation; and we think that the best mode of framing that provision would be to charge the succession of rateable property upon the life interest of the persons

succeeding in the net annual income after the deduction of encumbrances.

We propose that the duty should be leviable, as was proposed by Mr. Pitt, in eight half-yearly instalments. In cases where there is a succession to a life interest, our proposal would be that the unpaid residue of the tax should drop in the event of a new succession before the last instalment is payable; but in the case of a succession in fee, the whole will be charged, and if death occurs before the remaining instalment is paid, the duty will become a debt of the Crown against the estate. That is our proposal with regard to the legacy duties.

I now come to the financial results which we anticipate. The produce in the first year will be small. We do not propose to charge the new duty upon any succession anterior to the period when the Committee shall adopt the Resolution. The law allows twelve months for the payment of the legacy duties, and it will be impossible to fix the payment of the duty upon rateable property, if the Committee should adopt it, until after at least one of the ordinary periods of the payment of rent. The duty in cases of personality will come in more quickly, but I cannot reckon upon a larger receipt from the alteration of the legacy duties for the year 1853-54 than £500,000 over and above the duty now received from this source. In subsequent years the amount will be greatly enlarged. I have no objection, as far as I am able, to state the results of my investigation as to future years, and I think I do not exaggerate when I say, that this tax, if it is adopted by the Committee, while it will add £500,000 to the income of the present year 1853-54, will add a further increase of £700,000 to the year 1854-5, £400,000 more to the year 1855-6, and £400,000 more to the year 1856-7, making a total addition to the permanent taxation of the country of not less than £2,000,000 per annum. And this, I must remind the Committee, is a tax which will leave wholly untouched the intelligence and skill of the country. It is a tax that gives the relief, and more than the relief, that you aim at by the reconstruction of the income tax, but does it without the danger which would necessarily attend that reconstruction.

MR. DISRAELI: Does that apply to the three kingdoms?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is a general change of the law as to legacy duties, and one which takes no cognizance at all of one kingdom or the other.

It has long been considered as a great object of financial

policy to effect the equalization of the spirit duties between the three countries. It is, however, a very difficult problem. It is very doubtful whether it will ever be entirely attained ; but such an approximation to it as would stop smuggling might perhaps, at some time, be reached. It is quite plain that such an equalization cannot be obtained without some reduction of the spirit duties in England. We must lower the English duties at a fitting time to some point, up to which the others may be raised. In the present year we do not propose to make any change in the English spirit duties, for that question is much mixed up with the licensing system, which is now under the consideration of a Committee of this House. On account of its connexion with the principle of licensing in populous districts, for the present the question of the English spirit duties must stand over. But the Government are of opinion, after a careful consideration with respect to Scotland, that there is no reason why, in the case of Scotland, there should not be a moderate increase in the duty upon spirits. I believe that an increase of the duty, confined within due bounds, would not be opposed to public opinion, nor unacceptable in Scotland. An increase on the duty upon home-made spirits would render necessary an adjustment of the duty upon Colonial spirits, which I only mention now in passing, to obviate misconception, without going into details.

Our proposal will be, that a duty of 1s. be added to the 3s. 8d. a gallon upon Scotch spirits—allowing the malt drawback to remain as at present. The consumption in Scotland is 7,170,000 gallons. The actual revenue is £1,315,000. The expected revenue is £1,633,000, which is a gain of £318,000. I may here stop to congratulate a noble Lord opposite <sup>1</sup> on having attained a triumph. I ought, in strict propriety, to have reserved this until I came to Ireland, but the order of my subject has obliged me now to advert to it ; and I have to apprise him that his victory is at length achieved. We propose to save the money of the distiller, and likewise the time of this House, by making an allowance for waste upon spirits in bond. That allowance for waste will be in Scotland £40,000, which will give the net increase of revenue from the increase of the duty upon spirits in Scotland £278,000.

The Government have also anxiously considered this question as it regards Ireland. It is quite plain, I am afraid, that we can

<sup>1</sup> Lord Naas.

in no case stand as we are with regard to the Irish spirit duty, for an allowance for waste upon spirits in bond will entail a diminution of revenue. At present, the spirit duty in Ireland is extremely low in comparison with the duty in the two other countries. When an attempt was made to increase the tax in 1842 by 1s. per gallon, it was found most difficult to give effect to the increased duty; and we think it would not be safe to levy an additional tax of 1s. a gallon upon home-made spirits in Ireland.

But we have looked carefully to the means at our command for enforcing the levy of this tax.

In Ireland there is a revenue police, which has hitherto had the exclusive charge of enforcing this duty. But there is also maintained in that country at the public cost a large force, the constabulary, which has had no share whatever in giving information to those who have been engaged in levying the spirit duties. We contemplate a change in the relation of these two forces. I cannot say whether it will ultimately involve an absorption of the one force into the other, nor shall I now describe in what way it will be done; but the constabulary will, in a manner that we think will be effective, give their assistance in the levying of the duty upon spirits. We think that, under these circumstances, we may fairly propose an increase of duty of 8d. per gallon on Irish spirits—namely, from 2s. 8d. to 3s. 4d., subject to the deduction of £40,000, the allowances for waste spirits in bond. This will give us a gross gain of £238,000 upon the consumption of Irish spirits; but deducting the allowance for waste of £40,000, we have a net gain of £198,000. That gives from both countries—Scotland and Ireland—an increase of £476,000. But it is necessary that I should make an allowance for waste in England, not for the sake of English distillers, but for the sake of Irish and Scotch distillers, with whom it is a great object to bond their spirits here. There will therefore be an allowance of £40,000 for waste in bond in England, which will have a net gain from the increased duty upon spirits of £436,000 a year.

There is one other very small augmentation of revenue that I propose, and that is, the revenue upon certain classes of licenses. If the Committee examine the present scale of licenses, they will see that they bear very unequally upon the minor and the greater tradesman; upon some classes it is uniform, as upon grocery and tea-dealers, and they pay the same, whether they

pay rent to the value of £5 or £500, whatever amount of business they transact. We do not propose to take up the more important questions as to those licenses which are connected with the sale of spirits, wine, and beer ; but we propose, in regard to the licenses of brewers, maltsters, dealers in tea and coffee, manufacturers of, and dealers in, tobacco, and soapmakers, to rectify the present scale of licenses, raising them at the upper end of the scale to a rate bearing some proportion to the value of the premises, or the amount of business. The gross increase of revenue arising from licenses I take at £113,000.

The whole amount of increased taxes which we propose to levy, and which will come into the accounts of 1853-4, is as follows :—Income tax, £295,000 ; legacy duty, £500,000 ; duty on spirits, £436,000 ; licenses, £113,000 ; these amount to a total of £1,344,000 ; which, with the anticipated surplus of £807,000, will give a fund of £2,151,000 available for the remission of taxation.

I cannot proceed further without stating more particularly the nature of our intentions with regard to Ireland. The Committee have found that we propose to make the income tax payable in Ireland for a moderate term, and at a descending rate, as in England, and that we propose to levy an increased tax of 8*d.* on spirits in Ireland, which may be a net tax of between 6*d.* and 7*d.* a gallon, after allowing for the waste of spirits in bond. But I have now to refer to that case which I lately mentioned of rent-charge formed by the Consolidated Annuities. It was the opinion of the Government that it was impossible for them to arrive at a final decision upon that important subject without carefully weighing the collateral questions of finance. The annuities represent a capital of £4,500,000 of public money, and in dealing with them the Government was bound to have regard to the actual situation of Ireland, recovering as it is from a season of the deepest distress, and also to have regard to the harmony of the relations between the two countries, and they thought they could not arrive at a final decision till they had considered the general plan of finance which it might be their duty to recommend, and its bearing upon Ireland.

They now recommend a measure which, if you adopt it, as I trust you will, will advance us one great step towards establishing an equalization of taxation between the three countries. It is true that the income tax is of temporary duration ; but you will show, by levying it, that there is a *bona fide* intention and a

rational prospect of equalizing the taxation. At the same time, it is important that you should consider the great necessities of a portion of that country ; and when you come to consider these things, it will be plain that the disposition of Parliament will be to adopt large and generous measures, and not to consider this as a mere question of money. You will consider this heavy charge—you will consider all that it represents—the recollections of the famine, the peculiar character of that awful visitation, the feelings of England to Ireland, and of Ireland to England, and you will feel the advantage of any measure that may seem to promote a more kindly tone between the two countries, and to relieve them from the relation of national creditor and debtor in which they now stand.

The Government have determined to make a large proposition. The £4,500,000 of Consolidated Annuities include £1,500,000 of debts that strictly belongs to the establishment of the Poor-Law in Ireland. That was a great social and national good—a great and permanent good to Ireland. But every good to Ireland is also a good to England. The other £3,000,000 consists of debts entirely connected with the famine. A Committee of the other House of Parliament have sat on this subject, and they have recommended a remission of £2,000,000 of this taxation. Sir, the plan of the Government, after maturely considering the whole question, is, to propose to Parliament that, from and after the 29th of last September, the Consolidated Annuities shall be wholly wiped away. They propose that the whole sum due from Ireland to England shall be remitted.

In remitting these charges, and in proposing an income tax upon Ireland, you will grant away an immense sum of money, but you will make a great stride towards that, the advantage of which I hardly know how to appreciate—namely, bringing the two countries towards the establishment of equalized taxation.

On the details of that subject, I need only add, because I shall be asked what I mean to do with the arrears, that all arrears in respect to Consolidated Annuities due up to the 29th of September will be paid as they would have been if the law had continued in force. On the other hand, nothing will be collected which has become due since the 29th of September ; and any money which has been so collected will be returned to those who have paid it, so as to take care that the non-paying classes obtain no advantage over those who have regularly and duly paid.

Now, Sir, we are inviting you to remit a capital sum, which

was nearly £4,500,000 and is still above £4,000,000, and to remit an annual charge of £245,000. Three-fourths of that annuity would continue for forty years, and one-fourth for various periods of from ten to thirty years.

The taxation we propose for Ireland would in the first two years be considerably higher than the taxation we propose to remove ; but if we look to the time when, as I have said, Parliament will be in a position to part with the income tax, Ireland will enjoy, and enjoy for a long term of years, a much larger remission of consolidated annuity than it will have to bear of additional burdens in the shape of the spirit duty.

So much for the case of Ireland. And now, Sir, as I have done with that most offensive part of my task, the imposition of taxation, I feel as it is said men are wont to feel—and as some of us have felt—when they have ended their long upward journey, and reached at length the summit of the Alps. Now I have the downward road before me and the plains of Italy are in my view. I come then, Sir, to consider the more agreeable subject of the remission of taxation—that remission of taxation to which, in whatever form, up to this moment, not from obstinacy, and not from petulance, but from a conviction of our public duty, we have thought it right steadily to decline acceding.

The first remission of taxation I shall propose has reference to the Excise Department. It is impossible to deny that there are great evils connected with the soap tax. In the first place, the system of drawbacks, which is a system incident to the use of soap in our manufactories, entails an immense loss by fraud. In the second place, this is an article of taxation which is most injurious both to the comfort and the health of the people. In the third place, this is an article on which the pressure of the tax is so severe, that, notwithstanding the general wisdom and fairness with which your excise laws are administered—notwithstanding the drawback you grant on exportation—your productive power is crippled by the tax. You cannot compete with the foreigner ; your export trade dwindles day by day ; and gentlemen who have come to me to represent the case with respect to soap—well-informed gentlemen—have stated that if you will only take that bold measure with respect to the soap tax which we shall recommend, over and above the entire rate of duty, the consumer of soap would benefit to the extent of no less than 25 or 30 per cent., in consequence of the cheapened production. Therefore, for every penny of duty we ask you to

surrender, we feel that we are giving double that advantage to the consumer, and a great impetus to trade.

There is one other point to which I cannot but feel that I must advert. The question of the African slave trade is one which excites different feelings among us. We have but one sentiment, indeed, with respect to the extinction of the slave trade, but there is a difference with respect to the measures to be taken for that extinction. Some have thought the means of force used are unavailing; but all agree that the promotion of legitimate commerce would be the most satisfactory, the most effective, and the most desirable of all instruments you can apply. It may be said there is a wide interval between the premises and the conclusion if I say, in order to extinguish the slave trade, repeal the soap tax. But a connexion more legitimate than this any gentleman cannot well imagine. The map would show how many are the rivers of the coast of Africa; those rivers may for the most part each become depôts for the trade in palm oil. The quantities you may receive from that source are almost immeasurable. There are the great materials for a trade which, if you only relieve it from restraint, will show that the energy, the capital, and the intelligence of the country are as well entitled to carry away the palm in this particular industry as they show themselves to be in so many other trades.

The gross receipt from the soap duty is £1,397,000; the drawback, £271,000; the net receipt, £1,126,000; the cost of collection, £15,000; the net final loss, £1,111,000. But with reference to the general necessity for fixing a time to commence the remission of duties, the most convenient time for this purpose in regard to the soap duty is the 5th of July. There is also conceded to the manufacturer a power of keeping his soap in bond if it is thought fit to do so. There is already a sum due with reference to the quarter just expired, of £140,000, and before the present quarter is out probably £200,000 will be due on these accounts. We have to credit this year with the sum of £340,000, and the net loss for this year will be £771,000.

I come next to the division of the stamp duties. It is not possible for the Government, with all the means at their service, to deal with all the articles they would wish. There are articles—such as the stamps on fire insurance and marine insurance—on which they would gladly, if they could, grant remissions of taxation. But they have made the best choice in their power with the limited means at their disposal.

One subject that naturally presented itself to them, both in connexion with the income tax and likewise as bearing directly the character of a tax on prudence, and bearing it especially as against the poorer classes, is the present tax on life assurance. It bears very heavily on the poorer classes, though not severe in itself. At present it amounts to half-a-crown per cent. We propose to reduce it from 2s. 6*d.* to 6*d.* The produce is £40,000—the immediate loss, or amount of relief gained, will be £29,000.

We propose next to deal with an article which in its present state is most unsatisfactory, and that is the article of stamps on receipts. This is a duty which does not grow as it ought with the transactions of the country, a duty which is evaded wholesale, and a duty which I must say entails very considerable inconvenience. It is not the mere question of charge that measures the burden and annoyance of a tax, but the necessity of dealing in particular papers, stamped with particular amounts, which you have to send and get as occasion requires, with trouble and loss of time; all these are little things, but all of them enter very much into the question of inconvenience, and create just objection to the tax. What we propose is, to make an entire change, and adopt a system analogous to the system found so convenient for the public with reference to postage—namely, that of penny stamps. We propose by a penny stamp on instruments for any payment in money, as contrasted with negotiable instruments, to make such payment valid. Though the first loss to the revenue will not be inconsiderable—namely £155,000, it is not a loss without hope of recovery. We think that it is a loss to which the Committee, for the sake of so great a convenience, would be disposed to accede. The penny stamp crossed and defaced by the writing would be necessary to constitute a valid document of discharge. As you have to pay 3*d.*, 6*d.*, 1*s.* at present, so we propose to annex the single condition of affixing a penny stamp as sufficient. The stamp may also be attached to bankers' cheques, so as to make them valid and legal receipts, or in order to legalize their transmission from one place to another without limit of distance.

We propose to make a change with respect to those indentures of apprenticeship which are known as indentures without consideration. This is a duty which produces very little, from the charge being too high: from 20*s.* we propose to reduce the duty to 2*s.* 6*d.*

The next question I have to mention is one popular with the

majority of this House—unpopular with the minority. It is the case of the attornies. I must confess that I do not think that the vote of the House of Commons taken upon this question would have justified the Government in proposing a remission of this duty, because we feel strongly that an isolated vote of the House of Commons, given on a particular duty, is given necessarily on considerations attaching to that particular duty, and without reference to the comparative and relative claims of others. But we do think, in consideration of legislative changes, which have been lately made, and which have tended, by indirect as well as direct action on the law, to diminish the business of attornies, that there might be some remission of taxation. What remission should it be? We are not satisfied with the proposal made by the profession. The profession is subject to three charges. The first is on admission to practice, which is small. The next is the charge for the annual certificate, which is £12 for the metropolitan solicitors, and £8 for country solicitors; and, thirdly, the charge for articles of clerkship is put at the enormous amount of £120—a charge on capital paid by solicitors in anticipation, though they may die, though they may turn out incompetent, or may by any one of a thousand accidents be prevented from proceeding to the profession. The profession said, “Take the tax off the annual certificates for those who are in the profession; leave those who have to enter to pay precisely the same.” We do not think that would be a wise mode of dealing. Having made up our minds that we may propose a remission of about £50,000, we propose to apply this remission in fair proportion to the certificates and the articles of clerkship; to reduce certificates from £12 and £8 to £9 and £6, and articles of apprenticeship from £120 to £80.

I come now to the question as to advertisements. With respect to that question, I hope the Committee will not consider that it indicates any disrespect for the judgment at which the majority of the House recently arrived, if, having the same object in view, and desiring to bring about some more effective modification of the present taxation, we, having been led by our examinations to believe that there is a better mode of proceeding than that which the House adopted, think it our duty respectfully to submit that mode of proceeding to the deliberate consideration of the Committee; and it is right I should say that the plan I am about to state was a plan which the Government had already adopted at the time of the debate on Thursday last. It may, perhaps, be said, “Why did you not say so!” My answer is

this—that it was from no sentiment of mortification, that it was from no desire to practise an undue reserve ; it was because we feel that, if the Executive Government is, with advantage to the country, ordinarily to discharge the function of the initiative with respect to finance, it is absolutely necessary that the strictest silence should be observed—not in contempt of pressure, but yet, notwithstanding all pressure—till the time arrive when the views of the Government can regularly and comprehensively be disclosed.

What we propose with respect to the duty on advertisements is this—and financially our proposal comes within a mere trifle (within £20,000) of the other. The present duty on advertisements at 1s. 6d. yields £181,000. We propose to reduce the duty from 1s. 6d. to 6d. (MR. M. GIBSON: “ Oh ! ”) The right hon. gentleman could not wait on Thursday last for four days, and now he cannot wait for as many minutes. May I make that moderate demand on his patience ? It is absurd, and most of all should it appear so to the right hon. gentleman the Member for Manchester,<sup>1</sup> who has considered this question, to consider the duty on advertisements alone. You must consider it with reference to the other duties which affect the journals in which those advertisements appear.

I venture to say that, if you repeal the duty on advertisements simply, and leave the duties on the supplements of newspapers as they are, it is very doubtful whether a great part of your reduction will not go into the pockets of newspaper proprietors, and remain there without reaching the advertisers. You want a large increase in the number of advertisements, but you must take care that you don't subject people to taxation in another form by multiplying their advertisements. Take the case of *The Times*. You know it is obliged to limit its advertisements. I will not go into that subject ; but there is a point beyond which, in consequence of the 1d. a stamp on supplements, and the  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. stamp on supplements, it does not pay to insert advertisements, on account of the expense of printing and stamping the supplement ; and therefore a time comes when they must have a limit to the advertisements and put a higher price on them, on account of the supplement.

What we propose is this—to reduce the duty on advertisements to 6d., and, instead of taking off the remainder of the duty on advertisements, to repeal altogether that with which the plan

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.

of the right hon. gentlemen did not propose to meddle—namely, the 1*d.* and  $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* stamps on the supplements of newspapers which are used for printing advertisements. And I venture to say the plan we propose is far more sure to secure to the advertiser the benefit of the reduction than the plan which you propose; because, if you remove the advertisement duty altogether, then, when advertisements come into a newspaper, they must either be limited to the present sheet of the newspaper, with the present limited space, and no competition, or they must be liable to that heavy stamp duty which discourages the printing of supplements.

The first loss on the advertisement duty and the supplement stamps will be £160,000.

The only other change we propose is contingent on a Bill, by which my noble friend the Secretary for the Home Department<sup>1</sup> proposes to effect a material reduction in fares for the benefit of the metropolis. It is proposed to reduce the taxation on hackney carriages. A common hackney carriage pays 10*s.* a week. We think there ought to be a reduction, in conjunction with the reduction of fares. We propose to reduce the duty from 1*s.* 5*d.* a day to 1*s.* a day, which will give a relief of £26,000. The relief from the remission of taxation on the entire division of the stamp duties will be £418,000.

With reference to the point of the duty on advertisements, I hope that, in addition to the proposition I have stated as regards the bearing of the plan proposed last week, and the bearing of that proposed by the Government, the Committee will be willing to consider the effect that is likely to be produced by sweeping away entirely any branches of the revenue, if it be not revenue of an objectionable description—that is, of a description which cripples trade, and interferes with convenience and comfort in a degree disproportionate to the contribution it procures towards the public expenditure. I really do not see how it is possible in principle to maintain any duty whatever on fire and marine insurances—any duty on a great many articles which I fear both have long been, and must long be, the objects of taxation—if the arguments against the present advertisement duty are to be pushed to such a length as to stop at nothing short of absolute abolition.

We propose also to the Committee, that they should attempt to make a reform of the assessed taxes. That is a proposition which cannot fail to be acceptable; but the operation is not an

<sup>1</sup> Lord Palmerston.

easy one. If it is to be successful it must proceed on three principles: the abolition of what are called the progressive duties; the abolition of what are called compositions; and, lastly, the abolition, or the almost abolition, of exemptions, and a substitution for the present obscure and complicated system of rates and taxes which shall be few, simple, and as nearly as possible uniform. What the Government propose is, that instead of the present duties on men servants, beginning at a minimum of £1 6s. 6d., and running up through a great variety of rates, an uniform rate of £1 1s. on servants above eighteen years of age shall be levied, and of 10s. 6d. on servants under eighteen. Upon private carriages we propose, instead of minimum charges of £6 12s., £4 15s. 6d., and £3 11s. 6d., running up as before to rates still higher, to charge £3 10s., £2, and 15s. The duty on carriages let for hire, such as postchaises, will remain at £3; but the particulars relating to this subject will be more explicitly stated in the Resolutions. The duty on horses, beginning at £1 11s. 7d., mounts up through a great variety of rates. We propose that trade horses shall remain as now, at 10s. 6d., that the duty on ponies shall be 10s. 6d., and on other horses 21s. The hon. Member asks what we propose with respect to agricultural horses. We propose to leave them as they are now—exempt. We may be wrong. Exemptions, as exemptions, I do not like; but it appears to me that the case of agricultural horses is strictly analogous to that of steam power in factories. Our object is, irrespective of fear or favour, to propose what we think impartial justice to every class. I have received proposals suggesting the imposition of taxes on steam power. Of these I need scarcely say they were summarily dismissed. Whatever my love of symmetry I do not think it just to remove the exemption of duty which applies at present to horses employed in agriculture.

We propose to make a simplification of the duty on dogs. They are usually great favourites with their owners—not so much so with the rest of the community. There are two rates of charges at present on dogs—a duty of 14s., and one of 8s.; and these different rates, inasmuch as they lead to much difficulty and evasion, we propose to unite at a sum of 12s.

The immediate effect of these changes will be a loss of £87,000 on servants, £95,000 on private carriages, £118,000 on horses; but we have a gain of £10,000 in the case of dogs: so that the first loss by the remission of assessed taxes will be £290,000. As

in the case of stamps, however, our hope is that the first loss will in a great degree, and at an early period, be made up to the revenue. The assessed taxes are levied under seventy-two Acts of Parliament; and if the House wishes the system of these assessed taxes reformed, it must be prepared to support us in the principle of subjecting to moderate duties a great variety of articles, which now enjoy unwise and undue exemptions.

We propose, also, to change a system that does not strictly belong to the head of assessed taxes, but which is of an analogous character. I allude to the post-horse duties. The case of the post-horse masters is a very hard one. The present system is exceedingly unequal. The duty, which is heavy and burdensome, is levied on mileage, and is subjected to all manner of difficulties in the collection. It is raised by the issuing of tickets taken up at the first turnpike; and I may state, in the first instance, that I believe the largest post-masters in the kingdom are in London, whose principal traffic is to the railway stations, where there are in many cases no turnpikes whatever. Altogether, the system is indefensible, the duty too onerous in its amount, and, as I have said, very unequal in its distribution. We propose, in dealing with this matter, to take the plan that has been submitted to us by the postmasters themselves. Their own proposal was a very fair one, for they declared they were not so anxious for a remission of taxation as for an entire change of the system. They propose that the bulk of the tax shall be levied in the form of licenses, which licenses shall vary according to the number of horses and carriages. In this way we propose to make a remission of £54,000 a year in favour of the postmasters. We propose a scheme of duties on the licenses for horses and carriages, which will realize a sum of £161,000 a year, giving, as I have said, a remission of £54,000 a year.

Another change falling more nearly under the head of assessed taxes than any other of the main divisions of my subject, is proposed with the view of giving greater facilities for the redemption of the land tax. The present provision of the law for the redemption of the land tax is very stringent, and its operation is in consequence exceedingly limited. You may redeem a tax of £1 levied on the land, by transferring to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt 22s. a year in the Funds; but these are extremely unfavourable terms; and, instead of requiring 10 per cent. more than the amount of the tax, we propose to reduce it by  $17\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; that is to say, we propose to

take  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. less than the amount of stock which would yield an annual interest equal to the tax redeemed.

The Committee should be aware that any change made with relation to the assessed taxes cannot come into operation during the present year; and if at a future period of the Session we shall, in pursuance of my statement to-night, ask the House to pass an Act called an Assessed Tax Act, the operation of the change will be as follows. The Act will be framed to take effect in the financial year April, 1854-5, and persons will then be charged upon the articles they may have kept, not from April, 1853, to April, 1854, but from 10th October, 1853, to 5th April, 1854. Out of all the losses of revenue, or commutations of taxes, under this branch of the assessed taxes, only one, involving the loss of £54,000 on post-horse duty, would come into effect this year, and of this only one-half would come to charge—namely, from 10th October to the 5th of April.

I have still an important branch of remissions to mention. There will indeed be a loss of revenue in the plan proposed with reference to Colonial postage, but on that I do not enter, as I doubt if any part of it will come into the present year. I pass on, therefore, to the important head of Customs Duties, which still remains untouched. Now, with reference to the Customs Duties, I may state that no branch of revenue has attracted more the attention of the Government, as they feel that it is here, after all, that the elasticity of the powers of the country has chiefly been shown; and they think that it is by these powers they are supported and justified in the proposal they are now about to make with the hope of producing an effective result as regards many articles of Customs Duties.

I will first, however, mention an article of importance in which we can make no change, and that is the article of wine. I refer to this tax, as it is a subject of peculiar susceptibility, and the cause of an agitation out of doors, which is almost as perilous to the wine duties as certain climates are to the growth of wine itself; and because it is desirable that if the House and the Government think no change can be made in the duty, that opinion of the House and the Government should be clearly and intelligibly expressed.

There are three plans, any one of which may be followed with regard to wines. One would be to reduce the duty to a low uniform duty of 1s. 6d., or 2s., or at most say 2s. 6d., the gallon. Now, you cannot do that unless you are prepared to sacrifice an

amount of revenue for the first year of at the very least £700,000, besides an additional difficulty in regard to the drawback on stocks on hand, with respect to which it is not impossible that the Government might form a sturdy resolution in which the House of Commons might afterwards be induced not to concur. But, whether that be so or not, a loss to the revenue of £700,000 more on the article of wine is very serious ; and the importance of the change in connexion with its cost will not, we think, advantageously bear a comparison with other objects that the Government have in view. Another plan would be to fix a duty of several rates on wine of different values, somewhat resembling the duty on different qualities of sugar. But if that is attended with difficulty in the case of sugar, with how much greater difficulty would it not be attended in that of wine ? It has many recommendations, certainly, and this among them, that it would admit low classes of wine at a smaller loss to the revenue. But the Revenue Department would have the greatest difficulty in carrying out such a system ; it would be complex in its operation ; the wine trade, almost to a man, are opposed to it ; and I cannot say that public opinion is so much in favour as to induce us to attempt to carry it into effect. That being so, there is no choice for us but to say that, whatever be our opinion of the operation of the present wine duty, we are unable to propose any change in it, and we must pursue the third and only remaining plan—that is, to retain the existing duty. While we cannot propose any change in it at the present time, neither can we see any definite or early prospect of a change hereafter.

I go to the next article, which is tea. I will not discuss the reasons that exist for reducing the tea duties. It would be idle to do so, for the question is already settled in public opinion, and I have yet work to do before I close. And, as we have agreed to make a reduction in the tea duties, so we have acceded to the general principle recognized by the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli), on the part of the late Administration, that it would be most unwise to make the reduction to 1s. by a single leap. It is almost demonstrable, so far at least as a negative is capable of demonstration, that you cannot have the slightest hope of such an immediate increase of supply as would indemnify the revenue, or even bring the loss within moderate bounds, and, what is of yet more importance, secure the main benefit of the reduction to the consumer.

What we propose is this, to take the first step just as it was to

be taken by the right hon. gentleman opposite last year, and reduce the duty, at once, from 2s. 2½*d.* to 1s. 10*d.* We have carefully considered the present state and prospects of the supplies of tea. The condition of the Chinese Empire, at this moment, is certainly not as favourable to such extended supplies as we could wish. We cannot entertain sanguine expectations that any very large addition will be made in the next twelve months to the quantity available for the wants of this market; but, notwithstanding, we hope and believe, if there shall not exist a chronic state of revolution in China, which is a thing not to be supposed—that, so far as the production of tea is concerned, a short time, a couple of years probably, would be sufficient to put us in possession of a perfectly adequate addition to our supply.

We propose, therefore, to take the first step, as the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) took it, but we propose, thereafter, to proceed somewhat more rapidly. We shall take the first reduction from the date when the House, if it coincides with us in opinion, shall adopt the Resolutions. To the 5th of April, 1854, it will be 1s. 10*d.*; to the 5th of April, 1854-5, it will be 1s. 6*d.*; to April, 1855-6, 1s. 3*d.*; and from April, 1856, it will be 1s. The whole time occupied in effecting the descent from 2s. 2½*d.* to 1s. would thus be less than three years. We hope, with favourable circumstances, thus to bring in the supply necessary to meet increased demand, but we could not venture to recommend to the House the adoption of any shorter period for effecting the change. Again let me warn the Committee that they must not suppose that this is a change which, if we take a clear and dispassionate view of it, can be effected without a heavy loss to the revenue in the first instance.

The amount of remission, indeed, will be enormous. If any gentleman will calculate the difference between 2s. 2½*d.* and 1s. on the amount of tea consumed during the last year, he will find it come to nearly £3,100,000—a sum much too large to reckon upon recovering all at once. By the arrangement I have stated, the computed loss of the first year will be £366,000; for the second year, £510,000; for the third year, £454,000; and for the fourth year, £604,000; making altogether a positive diminution on the Customs revenue in these years of £1,934,000. But at the same time the loss, we trust, will undergo thenceforward a rapid and steady diminution.

In proceeding to consider more generally the state of our tariff, we have been desirous to carry into effect something like

a new revision of taxes, and to apply to it, wherever our means would permit, the following general rules : first, to abolish altogether the duties which are unproductive, except in cases where there may be some special reason to retain them on account of their relation to other articles ; and, in the next place, to abolish, as far as considerations of revenue will permit, duties on articles of manufacture, except such as are in the last stage as finished articles, and are commonly connected with hand labour, in regard to which cases we have thought it more prudent and proper to proceed in the mode, not of abolition, but of reduction ; in these cases we have endeavoured to fix the duties in such a way that as a general rule they should not stand, as to any class of goods, higher than 10 per cent. on their value. As I have referred to 10 per cent., I may state that we have not thought it right to propose a reduction in the silk duties, which are 15 per cent. The question of the silk duties is mainly a question of revenue, and in regard to it we do not think it is an article that has the strongest claims upon our consideration ; for, in so far as it is an article into the manufacture of which protection enters, the protection has mainly reference to certain classes of operatives with respect to whom it would be the disposition of Parliament to proceed carefully and with great circumspection.

We desire further, whenever it can be done, to take the mode of substituting rated duties for duties *ad valorem*, and to get rid in every case, except in a few instances where it is important on account of revenue, of the 5 per cent. addition to the Customs duties made in 1840, which, besides raising duties, greatly complicates the transactions of business.

We propose, in many instances, where there are at present differential duties in favour of British possessions, to merge those differential duties altogether by lowering the foreign article to the level of the colonial ; but where we are not able to lower the foreign article to the level of the colonial, we have not thought it would be considerate in any case to raise the duty on the colonial article. Lastly, we have been desirous to lower the duties that press on foreign articles of food which enter largely, if not into the necessities of life, at any rate into what may be called the luxuries and comforts of the mass of the people.

Now, the application of this last rule will be as follows : as to articles of food, we propose to lower the duty on a number of articles, of which the principal are these :—Apples, from 6*d.* and 2*s.* a bushel to 3*d.* ; cheese from 5*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* per cwt. ; cocoa,

from 2*d.* to 1*d.* per pound ; nuts, from 2*s.* to 1*s.* per bushel ; eggs, from 10*d.* to 4*d.* per 120 ; oranges and lemons, from a variety of rates, all of them high, to 8*d.* per bushel ; butter, from 10*s.* to 5*s.* per cwt. ; raisins, from 15*s.* 9*d.* to 10*s.* per cwt. The produce of these articles to the revenue at the present moment is £531,000 ; the immediate relief given by the deduction on the same quantities would be £262,000, but, with the allowance which we think may be made for an immediate increase of consumption, the probable net loss will be £185,000.

Besides these articles of food, which are thirteen in number, including tea, there are 123 articles which we propose to set altogether free from duty, involving a loss of £53,000, and 133 more articles which we propose to reduce, involving a gross loss of £70,000, but one which, with an allowance for increased consumption, may be taken at £52,000. The effect of this will be generally to effect a great simplification of the present system. With respect, however, to *ad valorem* duties, the Committee will recollect, that the abolition of them, however desirable in other respects, will by no means simplify the Tariff. In several cases, for example in the case of musical instruments, we must introduce a number of complex descriptions to get rid of one apparently very simple one. The Resolutions I shall lay on the table will enable the House, when they come to the consideration of them, to assist the Government in determining whether in any of the cases I have stated it will not be better to adhere to the *ad valorem* duty. All I now say is, that if the proposal does not wear the appearance of simplicity that may be desired, it is because this change of necessity tends to multiply specifications.

The effect of these various changes in the Customs duties, as applicable to the year 1853-54, will be to produce a gross loss of £1,338,000, but a loss which, we trust, will again be reduced by increase of consumption to £658,000. And now, Sir, I will sum up the entire effect of these operations for the financial year 1853-54. The remissions of taxes we propose as applicable to 1853-54 will cause a gross loss in the Excise of £786,000, or a net loss of £771,000 ; in stamps, a gross loss of £417,000, or a net loss of £200,000 ; in post-horses, £27,000 ; in Customs, altogether, the gross amount of £1,338,000, or a net loss of £658,00, thus showing a remission of taxation for the present year of £2,568,000, and a loss incurred by the revenue, after allowing for the degree in which the remission will be replaced by increased consumption, of £1,656,000.

Therefore, Sir, the state of the account for 1853-54 stands thus :—We have a surplus of £807,000. We invite you to grant us the means of raising, by new taxes, the sum of £1,344,000, making an available fund of £2,151,000. We propose to enact a remission of taxes, to take effect at once, that will entail a loss to the revenue of £1,656,000. There will remain a surplus sum of £493,000, of which a portion, exceeding £200,000, will be, not from permanent sources, but in the nature of occasional or incidental payment. The Committee will, I think, be of opinion that it would not be prudent, especially as we have in contemplation a scheme affecting the debt, to proceed with a surplus less than this. Indeed, it may appear too small ; but the Committee will presently see that the following year, 1854-55, may make some addition to it.

I have still the important duty to discharge of redeeming the pledge which I gave the Committee, to the effect that the Government were not paltering with you or with the people of England about the income tax ; but that when we say we propose to place you in a condition to remove it at a future day, which day we are prepared to fix, we make that proposal on the basis of calculations which, though they are of necessity less definite, and less susceptible of accurate verification than if they referred to the present moment only, yet, I think, are founded on a safe and reasonable basis.

First, let me present to you the balance sheet for 1854-5. We left the year 1853-54 with a surplus of about half a million, a considerable portion of which does not consist of permanent income. In 1854-55 you will have additional sources of income that will be available, more than countervailing the new charge. The additional charge will be—on tea duties, £510,000 ; on post-horses, £27,000 ; the remainder of the soap duties, £340,000 ; assessed taxes, £170,000 ; colonial postage, £40,000. All the additional charges which we now invite you to calculate upon for 1854-55 will be £1,087,000. Then the legacy duty will be available for the second year to the extent of £700,000 ; the reduction of interest on the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cents., of which, according to the usual principle of computation, one-half is taken credit for, will give a sum of £312,000. The second moiety of the extension of the income tax will add to this income £295,000.

Putting these sums together, you will find that the whole additional charge to be made for 1854-55 will be £1,087,000 ; and the additional income which I propose being £1,307,000 ; there

will be, so far as that year is concerned, a profit which will justify the Committee, I think, in giving its assent, notwithstanding the narrowness of the surplus with reference to the extent of the scheme, to the remissions which I have proposed. At the same time it is right that the Committee should have fully and clearly in view the complete extent of these remissions of indirect taxation. They will be as follows :—Soap duties, £1,126,000—(I am not taking the extent of the relief of immediate loss to revenue, without any allowance for the recovery in cases of reduced duty) ; stamps, £418,000 ; assessed taxes, £290,000 ; post-horses, £54,000 ; total, so far as the Board of Inland Revenue is concerned, £1,888,000. Then, in the Customs duties, the gross loss will be no less than £3,084,000 ; on articles of food—butter, cheese, and the rest—£262,000 ; on minor duties, £120,000 ; or a total relief under the head of Customs duties of £3,466,000. Adding to these various amounts the small sum I have described under the head of Colonial postage, £40,000—the entire amount of remissions of indirect taxation to which the Government now invite the Committee to assent, will be not less than £5,384,000.

With this remission of indirect taxation we propose to combine the bringing about a state of things, or the rational prospect of a state of things, in which you can, if you so please, really part with the income tax. Let me now, therefore, represent to you the state of accounts which sums up and winds up the whole of this protracted statement. The remissions of indirect taxation proposed, amount, as I have just explained, to a gross loss of £5,384,000. Looking back to the remissions which have been made in late years, which began in 1843, and which were renewed on a very large scale in 1845 and 1846, we find that these remissions—within terms, as to some of them of eleven years, some of them of five or six years, but in the mean term of seven or eight years—have completely, or almost completely, recovered themselves.

The effect of such remissions in the way of recovery we have found to be two-fold : first, that upon the consumer of the particular article, enabling him to increase his particular consumption of the various articles ; secondly, that upon the general consumer, operating for the extension and invigoration of the trade of the country, and in that way extending and widening the means of consumption on the part of the great body of the people, and so in a still more powerful manner replacing the first loss occasioned by remission. We assume, that what has happened

before will happen again; that these remissions of indirect taxation, which are analogous to the remissions that have been made heretofore, will, as these former remissions have done, replace themselves in about the same time; and I therefore assume that, so far as these remissions are concerned, you will, by the expiration of the income tax, find these taxes very nearly in amount what they now are. I will not enter into the question of what taxes you may think proper to repeal or reduce in the interval. It is sufficient for me to provide for the remissions which I now propose, and in the proposal of which I do not invite you to undermine—but, on the contrary, I ask you to increase and confirm—the stability of the financial system of the country.

How are we to attain a rational prospect of being able to part with the income tax in 1860? The country, after so many announcements have been made to it from time to time that the income tax was to be parted with, has become, doubtless, incredulous on the subject, and may, perhaps, conceive that we are aiming at a fictitious and undeserved popularity when we seek to show that, together with our remissions of indirect taxation, we can enable the House to surrender the income tax; but the statements shall be put plainly before the Committee—the Committee and the country can form their own judgment on them.

The amount of the income tax, as we have it now, is £5,550,000; this amount will be increased, as I have proposed, by the addition of £590,000. The gross amount, therefore, of this duty, so increased, will be £6,140,000. I will not enter into a detail of its composition, and of the descending rates, but, taking the tax at £6,140,000, let us inquire in what condition Parliament will stand with reference to the parting with so large a sum of money. It will stand thus:—In the first place, there will be available, as additions to the permanent sources of income—legacy duty, £2,000,000; spirits, £436,000; licenses, £113,000; making a total of £2,549,000 towards the fund which we must provide in order to put Parliament in a position, if it should so think fit, to part with the income tax.

Then we come to the anticipated reductions of charge, which of course will be as effectual to the purpose in view as positive additions to the revenue. The first of these reductions of charge is that on the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cents., which we owe to the wise measure of the right hon. Member for Cambridge<sup>1</sup> in 1844; that measure will bring to the account £624,000. Then, bad as is our case

<sup>1</sup> Mr. H. Goulburn.

with regard to the national debt, and loth as I am to encourage extravagant expectations in that quarter, yet it must be recollected that by the regular application of surpluses, and by the lapse of annuities, we in a small way operate from year to year, both on the capital of the debt and on the annual charge. Look back for the last eleven years, and you will find that since 1842 we have reduced the charge of the national debt, by these minor measures, irrespective of greater operations, at the rate of £80,000 per annum. I will assume this to continue. I trust, a safe assumption, for I venture to hope that whatever the pressure upon our finances, and whoever may hold the reins of government, we shall always think it one of our main public duties—to make ample provision for maintaining the efficiency of the public service, and the credit and honour of the country. I will assume, I say, that we shall continue to have the same amount applicable to the yearly reduction of the charge which we have had heretofore ; and, taking that amount accordingly at £80,000 per annum for the eight years up to 1861, this will give you a sum of £640,000.

Adding this reduction of charge, which may be reasonably expected, to the sums to be created by the new means of taxation—which latter I have stated to be £2,549,000—we shall have an aggregate total of £3,813,000. Then, in 1859–60, there will fall in the heavy burden of the Long Annuities and of another large portion of our terminable annuities. The first of these is £1,292,000, the second £854,000 ; together they will operate a relief of £2,146,000. Adding this amount to the sum of £3,813,000, which I have already stated, you will find that, between the additional resources from taxation, and the reduction of charge which will accrue in the interval, and the falling in of the Long and other Annuities at the expiration of the period I have named, there will be an available increase of means at the disposal of Parliament, should the present plan of the Government be adopted, in the year 1860 to no less an amount than £5,959,000, against the £6,140,000 of income tax, which will be the total amount of that tax at that period. In the year 1860–1, half of the income tax at 5*d.* will be available. The balance I have stated will be applicable as respects the following year. The Committee may now judge whether I have been justified in the language I have used with respect to the surrender of the income tax. I have only to add that its surrender, added to the other changes we have now proposed, would make up in all a remission of taxes to the extent of £11,500,000.

Thus, then, Sir, if the Committee has followed me, they will understand that we found ourselves on the principle that the income tax ought to be marked as a temporary measure ; that the public feeling that relief should be given to intelligence and skill as compared with property, ought to be met, and may be met, with justice and with safety, in the manner we have pointed out ; that the income tax in its operation ought to be mitigated by every rational means, compatible with its integrity ; and, above all, that it should be associated in the last term of its existence, as it was in its first, with those remissions of indirect taxation which have so greatly redounded to the profit of this country, and have set so admirable an example—an example that has already in some quarters proved contagious—to the other nations of the earth.

These are the principles on which we stand, and these the figures. I have shown you that if you grant us the taxes which we ask, to the moderate amount of £2,500,000 in the whole, much less than that sum for the present year, you, or the Parliament which may be in existence in 1860, will be in the condition, if it shall so think fit, to part with the income tax.

Sir, I scarcely dare to look at the clock, reminding me, as it must, how long, how shamelessly I have trespassed on the time of the Committee. All I can say in apology is, that I have endeavoured to keep closely to the topics which I had before me—

*“ . . . immensum spatiis confecimus æquor,  
Et jam tempus equam fumantia solvere colla.”*

These are the proposals of the Government. They may be approved, or they may be condemned, but I have at least this full and undoubting confidence, that it will on all hands be admitted, that we have not sought to evade the difficulties of our position—that we have not concealed those difficulties either from ourselves or from others ; that we have not attempted to counteract them by narrow or flimsy expedients ; that we have proposed plans which, if you will adopt them, will go some way to close up many vexed financial questions—questions such as, if not now settled, may be attended with public inconvenience, and even with public danger, in future years and under less favourable circumstances ; that we have endeavoured, in the plans we have now submitted to you, to make the path of our successors in future years not more arduous, but more easy ; and I may be permitted to add, that while we have sought to do justice, by the

changes we propose in taxation, to intelligence and skill, as compared with property—while we have sought to do justice to the great labouring community of England by further extending their relief from indirect taxation, we have not been guided by any desire to put one class against another ; we have felt we should best maintain our own honour, that we should best meet the views of Parliament, and best promote the interests of the country, by declining to draw any invidious distinction between class and class, by adopting it to ourselves as a sacred aim, to diffuse and distribute—burden if we must ; benefit if we may—with equal and impartial hand ; and we have the consolation of believing that by proposals such as these we contribute, as far as in us lies, not only to develop the material resources of the country, but to knit the hearts of the various classes of this great nation yet more closely than heretofore to that Throne and to those institutions under which it is their happiness to live.

## THE COMMERCIAL TREATY

FEBRUARY 10, 1860

The Commercial Treaty with France in 1860 resulted in an immense increase of trade between the two countries, and therefore in the mutual advantage of both. It was explained and defended in Gladstone's financial statement of that year, where he proved that it was perfectly consistent with the strictest principles of free trade, because it made no changes which would not have been beneficial to this country if there had been no treaty at all. The same was true of France. But there were in both countries a considerable number of people who believed that the remission of duties on their own side would have been a loss if it had not been accompanied by a remission on the other, and with them the Treaty was a powerful weapon of persuasion, to say nothing of its value as a symbol of peace and good will. Gladstone sets himself to put beyond the possibility of doubt the fact that the benefits of commercial freedom may be combined with the fruits of international reciprocity. His accomplishment of this task was completely successful, so much so that the popularity of the Budget in England imperilled for a time its prospects in France. Many French Protectionists argued that if the Treaty were so good for us, it could not be good for them. It is undoubtedly true that, if the British Parliament had not lowered the duties on French wine, the French Chamber of Deputies, even under Imperial pressure, would not have lowered the duties on British iron. But it is none the less the fact, as Gladstone points out, that both operations were advantageous to the trade of both countries. The great expansion of business between British and French merchants which immediately followed the Treaty was an abundant confirmation of his argument. Cobden, who was the principal negotiator of the Treaty, has often been criticized because he supported a bargain for doing what ought to have been done without it. To this criticism there are at least two answers. In the first place the tax on the importation of French wine, though it deprived many people of a wholesome beverage, was not Protective. In the second place the diminution of the tax was a good thing in itself, and therefore the Treaty bound the British Government to nothing which was not favourable to the commercial interests of this country. No commercial Treaty has ever injured the development of free trade. The importance of this speech, besides its merits as an example of Parliamentary statement, is that it conclusively disposes of the fallacy that what one nation gains by a reduction of duty another nation must lose. Purely political reasons were, no doubt, given for the Treaty of 1860, especially the improvement which it established in the relations between Great Britain and France. Gladstone, however, is here concerned almost entirely with the financial aspect of the case, and with the ultimate effect of the Treaty upon the revenue. His exposition of the economic arguments for grasping the opportunity to remove fiscal barriers which really impaired the returns to the Exchequer by diminishing the volume of trade is a masterly analysis, which subsequent events entirely justified. Many speeches of the highest oratorical merit

fail to retain their hold upon the reader, because they deal only with an issue which has ceased to have any practical significance. The reasoning adopted by Gladstone here is of permanent value, because it applies to questions which are never out of date, and may always arise in a tangible form. He had to deal with two kinds of opposition. There were Protectionists, who dreaded an increase of foreign competition. There were zealots of free trade who objected to any artificial regulation of international dealings. Gladstone replied at the same time to both by demonstrating that the Treaty would promote trade, and that it was an encouraging, not a restricting, influence. Both countries were removing obstacles. Neither country was attempting to set them up. It was therefore quite possible to preserve all the benefits of free trade while adding to them the results of a mutually advantageous arrangement.

This speech has great political as well as great financial importance. When the Liberal party was reconstructed in 1859 after the General Election of that year by Lord John Russell's agreement to serve under Lord Palmerston, Gladstone became for the second time Chancellor of the Exchequer. There was war at the time between France and Austria, which resulted in the transfer of Lombardy from Austria to a new Kingdom of Italy, while Nice and Savoy were annexed by the Emperor of the French. Liberal opinion in England, indeed public opinion generally, represented especially by Palmerston, Russell and Gladstone, was extremely sympathetic with Italian aspirations, with King Victor Emmanuel, and with his great Minister, Cavour. But when Louis Napoleon, after making the Peace of Villafranca, which left Austria in possession of Venetia, took Nice and Savoy, with the connivance of Cavour, Palmerston turned against France, and jealousy of the French Emperor began to exercise a considerable influence upon the people of this country. It is now known that Louis Napoleon was himself always friendly to England, and sincerely desired the maintenance of a good understanding between the two nations. Richard Cobden considered that a Commercial Treaty with France would be highly beneficial both on economic and on political grounds. Through Gladstone he converted the Cabinet to this view, and was himself empowered, in conjunction with Lord Cowley, the British Ambassador at Paris, to negotiate with the French Government. The Treaty thus procured was the foundation of this Budget. But Gladstone's scheme contained also a proposal for the repeal of the Paper Duty, the last of what were called the Taxes on Knowledge, which was rejected by the House of Lords, and not passed till the following year, when for the first time the whole taxation proposed was included in one Bill, which the Lords had either to pass as it was, or reject altogether.

SIR,—Public expectation has long marked out the year 1860 as an important epoch in British finance. It has long been well known that in this year, for the first time, we were to receive from a process not of our own creation, a very great relief in respect of our annual payment of interest of the national debt—a relief amounting to no less a sum than £2,146,000—a relief such as we never have known in time past, and such as I am afraid we shall never know in time to come. Besides that relief other and more recent arrangements have added to the importance of this juncture. A revenue of nearly £12,000,000 a year, levied by duties on tea and sugar, which still retain a

portion of the additions made to them on account of the Russian war, is about to lapse absolutely on the 31st of March, unless it should be renewed by Parliament. The income tax, from which during the year we shall have derived a sum of between £9,000,000 and £10,000,000, is likewise to lapse at the very same time, although an amount not inconsiderable will still remain to be collected in virtue of the law about to expire. And lastly, an event of not less interest than any of these, which has made public feeling thrill from one end of the country to the other—I mean the commercial treaty with France which my noble friend the Foreign Minister <sup>1</sup> has just laid on the table—rendered it a matter of propriety, almost of absolute necessity, for the Government to request the House to deviate, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, from its usual, its salutary, its constitutional practice of voting the principal charges of the year before they proceed to consider the means of defraying them, and induced the Government to think they would best fulfil their duty by inviting attention on the earliest practicable day to those financial arrangements of the year which are materially affected by the treaty with France, and which, though they reach considerably beyond the limits of that treaty, yet, notwithstanding, can only be examined by the House in a satisfactory manner when examined as a whole. This must be our apology, if any apology be needed, for asking the House to take into its earnest consideration the matters which I am about to submit to it. And, Sir, every consideration both of gratitude for the kindness of the House to myself and likewise of public duty, will ensure that, if I have an extensive field to traverse and many subjects to open and discuss, I shall not, at least, make any wanton trespass on the time and attention of the House. The results of the finance of the last year, inasmuch as it has not positively reached its close, can only be presented in a form founded partly on account and partly on estimate. At the same time they may be given in figures on which the House may place reliance as being for every practical purpose perfectly safe. It is necessary for me here to remind the House that, as is not usually or frequently the case, circumstances have occurred during the later portion of the present year which tend materially to influence its results. The expedition to China has made it necessary to enlarge the proposed military and naval expenditure of the year, even beyond the liberal scale of provision

<sup>1</sup> Lord John Russell.

supplied by Parliament in the last Session ; and likewise the arrangements coming into force under the commercial treaty with France, in case the provisions of the treaty shall receive the sanction of the House—will act materially upon the Customs revenue for the residue of the year. I will, therefore, Sir, with your permission, first present to the Committee the state of the account as it stood, entirely apart from these disturbing causes, and I will then in a few words show the Committee how, since these causes have come into action, it is at present likely to stand. The results of the year in a financial point of view—at least, so far as receipts are concerned—have been eminently satisfactory. The Customs revenue, which I estimated at £23,850,000, and which I estimated at that amount so lately as the month of July last, will produce—apart from the cause to which I have referred—and I beg the House all along to bear this parenthesis in mind—£24,750,000. The Excise I estimated at £19,310,000 ; it will produce £19,724,000. The Stamps, however, show a small deficit, having been estimated at £8,100,000, while they will produce only £8,000,000. The Land and Assessed Taxes were estimated at £3,200,000 ; they will produce the same sum. The Income tax was estimated at £9,940,000 ; it will produce £9,894,000. The Post Office revenue was estimated at £3,250,000 ; it will produce that sum. The Crown Lands were estimated at £280,000 ; they will about fulfil that estimate. The Miscellaneous Revenue was estimated at £1,530,000 ; it will produce £1,480,000. The general result will be this :—The revenue was estimated to produce £69,460,000, and it would have produced £70,578,000. On the other hand, looking at the side of expenditure, we should have stood as follows :—The interest of the funded and unfunded debt, estimated at £28,600,000, will amount to £28,683,000 ; the Miscellaneous and Consolidated Fund charges amount to £1,960,000, the sum at which the estimate was taken ; the Army was estimated at £13,300,000, and it would, independently of the recent measure, have cost £13,550,000, in consequence of an excess of expenditure handed over from the preceding year. The Navy was estimated at £12,782,000 ; it would have cost £12,630,000. The expenses of the Civil Service—called miscellaneous—were estimated at £7,825,000 ; they would have cost £7,700,000. The Revenue Departments were estimated at £4,740,000 ; they would have cost £4,447,000. The total result is that, whereas the estimated charges of the year were £69,270,000, the total expenditure would

have been somewhat less, or £68,953,000. Comparing this expenditure of £68,953,000 with the receipts of £70,578,000, the Committee will perceive that we should have had a surplus of income over expenditure of not less than £1,625,000. That surplus would have been the result of the liberal and wise provisions made by Parliament in the past Session to meet the expenses of the year. As matters now stand, indeed, it will not be available for the reduction of the National Debt, for it has almost entirely been absorbed; yet, nevertheless, it may serve for a good example of the prudence of that rule which always induces this House, when appealed to for the purpose, to provide ample means to meet the public expenditure, inasmuch as Parliament will by means of it be enabled, if it shall think fit, to carry forward measures of great importance without any new financial provision.

But, Sir, after Parliament had adjourned, as I have stated, we had to encounter additional charges; and I come now to what I have called the disturbing causes which have acted on the revenue. The necessity of making provision for the expedition to China—an expedition to be the bearer, in the first instance, of peaceful remonstrance—cast an addition on the votes for military expenditure, which, together with an excess in the army expenditure in the year 1858-9, stands as follows:—Army, £900,000; Navy, £270,000. Then has arrived the treaty with France. It is very difficult indeed to estimate for so short a time as that which has to pass before March 31st what the results and effects of that treaty will be upon the Customs revenue, more especially as a question may arise with respect to certain payments which it may be quite requisite to make to a limited class of persons who are affected by some of the peculiar arrangements of that treaty. However, we have assigned what we think an ample amount; and I have therefore to deduct from the estimate which I have submitted to the Committee for the Customs revenue of the current year a sum of £640,000. We, therefore, stand worse than we should have stood by £1,170,000 for additional charges on the army expenditure, and also by £640,000 likely to be lost on our Customs receipts in consequence of the treaty with France. The total of these two is £1,180,000, which, being deducted from the surplus we should have had, would appear to place us on the wrong side of the account. But deliverance has come in from a quarter from which, perhaps, it would not have been expected.

“ Via prima salutis,  
Quod minime reris, Graia pandetur ab urbe.”

A friendly kingdom has undertaken to pay us a debt, and this at the very moment when she herself is engaged in war. Spain, not under any peculiar pressure from us, but with a high sense of honour and duty, not wishing to avail herself of the plea which, I do not hesitate to say, she might under the circumstances have advanced for time, has remitted to us a sum in bills which will shortly come due, of nearly £500,000, of which £250,000 will come to the credit of the revenue before March 31st. And now, Sir, if the Committee will take the trouble to compare the figures, it will be seen that we set out with a probable surplus of £1,625,000; adding to that surplus the £250,000 of which I have spoken, it becomes £1,857,000, against which we have a charge of £1,810,000; a state of the account which will leave the Chancellor of the Exchequer with a surplus—undoubtedly one of the narrowest on record, but still a surplus, not a deficit.

This, then, Sir, is the probable state of the account for the present year, ending with the 31st of March. I now proceed to approach the more extensive and more difficult part of the subject—that which relates to the charge and expenditure of the coming year 1860–61.

First, Sir, the estimated charge for the funded and unfunded debt in the coming year is only £26,200,000, which shows a decrease of £2,438,000—a sum considerably larger than the amount of the annuities which are about to fall in. But the reason of that greater decrease is that—as the Committee may probably recollect—we were called on last year to make a special provision for the quarterly payment that falls exceptionally into this year, in consequence of the determination of the annuities; whereas, if it had continued to run its full term of half a year, it would have gone into the year 1860–61. That arrangement swelled the charge for the debt in 1859–60, and proportionately augments the relief from that charge in the year 1860–61. Therefore, the charge for the debt stands only at £26,200,000. The Consolidated Fund charges, commonly so called, stand at £2,000,000, exhibiting an increase of £40,000. The Army and Militia, including a Vote of credit to the amount of £500,000, which it will be our duty to propose on account of the Chinese expedition, will amount to £15,800,000. The Navy and Packet Services—which I mention together for the purpose

of easier comparison with former years, though the packet service is likely to be separated from the Admiralty—will stand in the Estimates at £13,900,000. These two sums, which together include the whole military expenditure of the country by land and sea, along with the cost of the packet service, amount to £29,700,000, showing an increase of £3,618,000 on the Military Estimates, in the same sense of the term, which were voted last year, and an increase of £2,448,000 on the Military Estimates for the current year, as they stand augmented by the additional charge that will be brought upon them if the House should grant the sum for which the Government will think it their duty to ask.

The Miscellaneous Civil Estimates are taken at £7,500,000. That amount exhibits a decrease as compared with the Estimates of last year of £325,000; and if the Committee which the House has in some manner declared its intention of appointing, should be enabled to enter on its labours at an early period, and shall prosecute them with such vigour and success as to enable us to carry further the process of retrenchment, I assure the hon. gentleman who moved, the hon. Member for Birmingham who supported, and the other Members of the majority who carried the Motion for its appointment, that it will be a result acceptable to Her Majesty's Government.

The estimate for the Revenue Departments, standing at £4,700,000, presents an apparent increase of £225,000; but do not suppose that this is a real increase of the charge; it is due, to speak in general terms, to an increase of accommodation in the Post Office Department, which I have no doubt will continue to be fully balanced by the increase of revenue in that branch of the public service. The total amount of the six sums which I have stated to the Committee is £70,100,000.

With respect to one great and conspicuous head of increase—that on the Military and Naval Estimates—it is not my intention at the present to enter into any discussion; but it will be the duty of my right hon. friend and of my noble friend who represent those departments respectively<sup>1</sup> to explain that subject to the Committee at the earliest date, and to lay before them the nature of the special, and, we may hope, in a great degree temporary, causes which have rendered it necessary to make so considerable a demand on the country. Now, Sir, when we look at the estimated income for the coming year, it is a matter

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sidney Herbert and the Duke of Somerset.

of which the first view will hardly be found satisfactory. And I confess I am not sorry that the figures should be such as will at least draw serious attention to the whole subject. For it is well that, in addition to your annual review of the income and expenditure, there should be special junctures with circumstances so marked that you are obliged to institute a deeper and more comprehensive examination, and to consider more at large what is the proper scale both of taxation and likewise of expenditure for this great country.

The estimated income for 1861 will be taken by me in the first instance with reference simply to the law as it stands; except that I shall assume that the Committee would, almost as a matter of necessity, think it right to renew the taxes on tea and sugar at rates not less than that which they deliberately adopted in 1853. Pray understand that I am assuming the renewal of these particular duties at what would be called the *minimum* rate, but I shall assume nothing else beyond what is absolutely given us by the law, so that I may exhibit to the Committee, as fully and as clearly as I can, the nature and the whole extent of the deficit which they will have to supply, in order that they, on their part, may exercise the largest and the freest choice with respect to the means which they may think proper to adopt for that purpose.

Approaching the subject from that point of view, we estimate that the Customs will yield £22,700,000; the Excise, £19,170,000; the Stamps, £8,000,000; and the Taxes, £3,250,000. The Income-tax, that is one half-year still outstanding at the rate of 5*d.* in the pound, would yield £2,400,000; the Post Office, £3,400,000; the Crown Lands, £280,000; and the Miscellaneous Revenue, £1,500,000. The total of these receipts would be £60,700,000. The total charge which I have exhibited is one of £70,100,000; and the apparent deficit, I need hardly state to the Committee, amounts to £9,400,000.

I am not representing a brilliant state of affairs as respects the revenue and expenditure of the country, nor do I pretend to place on it any such colour. We have a prosperous country, a wealthy country, a country rapidly growing in wealth and power; but the relative state of your revenue and expenditure is such as I have described. And pray observe that in that charge of £70,100,000 we get the benefit of the £2,000,000 and upwards of annuities which will fall in during the year. I am bound, also, to say that I am not in a condition to ask you to

do all that might under other circumstances have been desirable. I frankly own that I do not feel myself in a position to propose, as I otherwise might have proposed, that you should make provision for the payment of the sum of £1,000,000, which will be due for Exchequer bonds in November next. Such as it stands, without any such provision, you have the deficit before you.

And now, Sir, it would be perfectly possible for me to close, were it not for the treaty which I have to discuss; it would, at any rate, have been perfectly possible for the House, if such were the view which they entertained, to close the whole account by a very simple, but, I must say, a very rude process. £9,400,000 is wanted. I will suggest to you two modes, by either of which you might have thought fit to supply it. You might have said, or you may still say, we shall keep the tea and sugar duties at their present rates; that determination would supply a sum of £2,100,000. But £2,100,000 taken from £9,400,000 still leaves the less formidable, yet rather intractable sum of £7,300,000. And now I beseech the Committee to observe that if they think with the Government that the large and ample provision which we are about to propose for the services of the country is a necessary outlay, they will have to make good the deficit of £7,300,000, irrespective of any treaty with France, of any relief to the people, of any improvement of the commercial laws, of any remission whatever of taxes affecting trade or industry, even to the extent of a single shilling. And what is meant by filling up the deficit of £7,300,000? It means, at any rate, an income tax of 9*d.* in the pound. The tax at that rate would give you for the year 1860–1 the sum of £7,672,000, or a surplus of £372,000. This would certainly be a possible measure. But, again, supposing you were to take a more liberal view of the matter, and to say we do not think it right that there should be no remission on articles connected with the trade and industry of the country, or that duties on tea and sugar which were imposed for the purposes of war, and have been kept on during three or four years of peace, should be further prolonged. Well, then, abandoning the war duties on tea and sugar, and keeping on what may be called the peace duties, then in order to fill up the deficit of £9,400,000 you would require the very neat and easily stated and easily understood sum of an income tax of 1*s.* in the pound. This also would be without any other remission of duty, and would be simply what is required for the general demands of the revenue.

Then, Sir, it may be said, and said with justice to many Members of Her Majesty's Government—but most of all with justice may it be demanded of me—what has become of the calculations of 1853? It is a perfectly legitimate question, and I can render to my hon. and learned friend who cheers it an answer so simple that the wayfarer “who runs may read” it. Our financial calculations dated 1853 are to be found in *Hansard*, and from that indubitable source I have within the last two or three days refreshed my recollections. Those computations I find are capable of being presented in a very simple form. We reckoned that we should gain upon revenue in the interval between 1853 and 1861 in the following proportions:—from new taxes then proposed, including the succession tax, £2,549,000; from lessened charge on account of the national debt, £1,264,000; at the same time we knew that terminable annuities would fall in in 1860 to the amount of £2,146,000. Adding together these three chief sources of relief, they make a sum of £5,959,000, which is as nearly as possible the sum to which the income tax, at the rate of 7*d.* in the pound, was estimated for the year 1851. The actual estimate was £6,140,000, which, with this sum of £5,959,000 to set against it, we should have been able to surrender. With regard to these calculations, they have suffered some damage; they have suffered considerable damage from what has since occurred. But that damage is not the cause of our not being able to dispense with the income tax. I can show demonstrably that this is not the case. The succession duty failed to produce what we expected of it, partly, or rather mainly, because it was found that by the usual course of succession real property goes in the direct line in a much greater number of cases than personal property; so that if £100,000,000 a year in real and settled property came under the succession duty, that amount would not yield the same average of duty as if it had been personal property. I do not now speak of a fact known to the Committee, that only life interest is valued with respect to real property but over and above that, real property descending in the direct line from father to son and grandson pays only 1 per cent. duty. That course of direct descent prevails in a much greater number of instances in real than in personal property, and consequently, while the revenue from this source attains its *maximum* more slowly than we anticipated, that *maximum* itself will also be lower. At the present moment for the year 1860–1, we stand worse than we reckoned in 1853

by £1,000,000 on account of the failure of the succession duty. Besides this, instead of being able to apply an annual surplus of revenue towards the extinction of debt, that surplus has been required by the necessities of war, and its application to the diminution of debt was stopped for three or four years. That likewise tended to disturb our calculations. The amount of this surplus may be taken at £320,000. But the most serious item of all was the additional debt contracted on account of the Russian war. It created an additional charge upon us of £1,400,000 per annum. Under these three heads, therefore, the deficiency in the amount of the succession duty, the stoppage of the surplus applicable to the extinction of debt, and the additional charge created by the Russian war—we stand worse than in 1853 by the sum of £2,720,000 a year. But, Sir, that sum has been fully compensated from other sources. The experiment I commenced with a timid hand in 1853, of raising the spirit duties, was again followed up by myself in 1854, and by my successors down to 1858. That increase has added a permanent revenue to the country of perhaps from £1,500,000 to £2,000,000 a year; and if, along with the general productiveness of the revenue, your expenditure had continued to be anything like what it was, you might have this day done what you please with the income tax. In 1853 the annual expenditure was £52,183,000. To that sum I add on account of the additional debt, £1,400,000, and £4,700,000 for the collection of the revenue; this would make the actual charge £58,283,000. But the estimate of the revenue for the year 1860–61, with the tea duty and the sugar duty each reduced to the *minimum* as fixed for a time of peace, is not only £58,283,000, it is £60,600,000, leaving a surplus at your disposal, without looking to any removal of the income tax, of £2,317,000, if your expenditure had continued what it was. A larger sum I need hardly remind the Committee, than the amount of income tax which will still be outstanding on the 1st of April. And now I come to the true explanation of your altered power. It is to be found simply and entirely in the comparison of charge at the respective periods. In 1853 the whole amount voted for Supply and Services of every description, including the Miscellaneous charges on the Consolidated Fund, was £24,279,000—that was the proportion of the public charge or expenditure that was under the control of Parliament. But in 1860–61, instead of £24,279,000, these charges amounted to £39,000,000, showing an increase in your expenditure of

£14,721,000. This increase is, as nearly as may be, the exact representative of what would be in itself an income tax of  $13\frac{1}{2}d.$  in the pound. I ask now, Sir, from my learned friend, whether I have not redeemed my pledge?

Sir, the period at which I address you is a period of so much interest and so much importance that, even at the risk of occupying a few minutes of your time, I wish to dwell a little on the subject of public expenditure, because I admit that my statement thus far, though true, and I hope clear, is an important statement. It would not be fair to speak of the great increase in the expenditure of the country without considering the great extension of the means by which that increase is supported. The country is richer than it was in 1853 in a degree really astonishing. Permit me to lay before the Committee, as well as I can, a criterion by which we may arrive at some idea of the truth with respect to the increase in the wealth of the country; and then we can institute a just comparison between the rate of increase in this wealth and the rate of increase in the public expenditure. The best mode of making an estimate of the rate of increase in the wealth of the country is to resort to the income tax. No other criterion is comparable to it, for, though it may not be an exact index of the truth in this matter, in any one year, yet, as between any one period and another, I believe it is an index on which we may safely rely. But, in taking the income tax as a measure of the income of the country, I beg to object to two out of the five schedules of the tax. Schedule C does not, I think, represent any portion of the wealth of the country in the sense of its productive power. It represents income from the funds, that is to say, a charge imposed upon the property of the country at large, just as a mortgage is imposed upon a particular estate. Schedule E represents the income of the fraternity to which I myself have the honour at present to belong, including the salaries of what are termed officials, that is to say, Ministers and others who are receivers of public allowances. But I do not take an increase in the salaries of these gentlemen as any material augmentation of the wealth of the country. What this House has been about I do not exactly know; I believe there has been a considerable transfer of officers from D to E, which may have imparted to the latter schedule something of a factitious augmentation; assuredly, however, the growth of that most respectable company of salaried gentlemen must have been viewed with delight by all who take an interest in the

body. But the test of the wealth of the country by comparison must be taken principally from Schedules A, B, and D. The profits derived from lands and tenements, from all real and moveable property, are included in Schedule A. Schedule B represents the tax levied upon the occupiers of land, and it varies mainly with the amount of rent paid. Schedule D includes the profits derived from trades and professions. I will take two periods; the period from 1842, when we commenced our great career of commercial legislation, to the year 1853, when we closed it—I hope to be renewed—under the pressure of war. I will also take the period from 1853-4 to 1857-8, because it is the last year in which the returns are made up; and I will carry it on for two years by estimate, assuming the same rate of increase to have continued to 1859-60. Now the net amount shewn by these three schedules of the income tax conjointly is as follows:—In 1842, £154,000,000; in 1853, £172,000,000; in 1857-8, £191,000,000; and in 1859-60, £200,000,000. The increase in the wealth of the country between the first period and the second was 12 per cent. in eleven years; the increase between 1853 and 1860, as thus returned, was 16½ per cent. in six years. That undoubtedly shows a very large increase in the wealth of the country. I think it will also be interesting to the Committee to know in what proportions that increase has been distributed between the classes represented by three of the Schedules to which I have referred; for I must say that the statement is one which throws a very considerable light upon the condition of the landed interests, and more especially upon that of our old friend, the farmer. I shall take the period from 1853-4 to 1857-8, a period of four years, for which we have the latest possible returns; and I find that during those four years the income under the head of Schedule D, which embraces the profits on trades and professions, grew from £64,974,000 to £70,703,000, or at the rate of 9 per cent.; while that under the head of Schedule A, which represents real and immovable property, grew from £96,129,000 to £106,972,000, or at the rate of 11¼ per cent. At the same time, Schedule B—which represents the profits of the farmer, but having, also, no small degree of reference to the rent of the landlord—grew no less than from £11,123,000 to £13,436,000, or at the rate of 19 per cent. That being the case, I rejoice to think that we now live in times when any hon. gentleman may, if he thinks fit, attend an agricultural dinner, and congratulate his hearers

upon the prosperity of their condition without being considered to offer them an insult. I must at the same time observe, lest I should appear to be representing the condition of this particular class in colours too sanguine, that during the period which elapsed between 1842 and 1853, the case was far different with it, inasmuch as Schedule B exhibited during that time, unfortunately, no increase whatever. A change has since taken place, and I am happy to say it is a change which must be satisfactory in the highest degree to the community at large.

Having thus spoken of the increase of wealth in the country, the Committee will perhaps permit me very briefly to compare it with the rate of increase in our expenditure. I shall in the first instance compare the growth of wealth with the total expenditure—that is to say, with the whole State as well as the whole local expenditure, as far as the latter can be ascertained; for the local expenditure of the country is likewise beginning to form a very considerable item in our financial calculations, and it shows a disposition to grow to an extent which makes it well worthy of the serious attention of the Committee. I may, in the first place, state that my hon. friend the Secretary for the Home Department<sup>1</sup> has been good enough to obtain for me certain returns in connexion with this local expenditure, which are trustworthy, although I do not mean my statements will be literally accurate, as they must in part be founded upon estimate. Well, then, to proceed—the gross expenditure of the State was, in 1842–3, £55,223,000, and the local expenditure in the three kingdoms was in the same year £13,224,000; making a total, in round numbers, of £68,500,000. In 1853–4 the total expenditure was £55,769,000, or very nearly the same amount as in 1842–3, and the local expenditure £15,819,000; making together, in round numbers, 71 millions and a half, instead of the 68 millions and a half which was the amount in 1842–3. In the year 1859–60 the gross State expenditure had grown from £55,769,000, which it was in 1853, to £70,123,000. The local expenditure—no doubt actuated by a spirit of honourable rivalry—increased in the same period from £15,819,000, which it was in 1853, to at least £17,458,000. The total expenditure for the year 1859–60 thus reached £87,697,000. It thus appears that in the eleven years from 1842–3 to 1853–4, the expenditure of the country under the two comprehensive heads which I have mentioned, increased at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., while in the

<sup>1</sup> Sir G. C. Lewis.

six years which have elapsed between 1853 and 1859 it became much more mercurial, and increased at the rate of  $22\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. But in order to bring home to the Committee the importance of the question which is raised, not so much by the gross amount of the Imperial expenditure as by that portion of it which is under the control of Parliament, and for which Parliament is responsible, let me take the increase which has occurred during the same period in the expenditure which has been voted by this House, or which is, for certain miscellaneous purposes, charged on the Consolidated Fund. The two items which come under this head I shall call optional expenditure, and I may briefly state that they amounted in 1842-3 to £21,487,000; in 1853-4 to £23,361,000. Thus the increase in this expenditure which, as I before said, is under the control of Parliament, and whose amount is in the main determined by public opinion, in eleven years amounted to no more than a sum of £1,874,000, or at the rate of  $8\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.; but during the period from 1853 to 1859, a period of six years, it increased from £23,361,000, at which it had stood in 1853-4, to £36,898,000, or at the rate of 58 per cent.

Now, therefore, you have at your command a tolerably complete comparison between the rate of growth in the wealth of the country and the increase in its expenditure. Between the years 1842 and 1853 the increase in her wealth was at the rate of 12, and that in her expenditure at the rate of  $8\frac{3}{4}$  per cent.; while between 1853 and 1859 the national wealth grew at the rate of  $16\frac{1}{2}$ , the public expenditure, so far as it was optional and subject to the action of public opinion, at the rate of 58 per cent.

I have troubled the Committee with these particulars because I deemed it right to invite their attention to what is a subject of vital importance. The country may be right in the course which she is now taking, but, at all events, that course ought not to be pursued blindfold. We ought, on the contrary, to have a clear knowledge of the proportion which our wealth bears to our expenditure, in order that we may be able to take a comprehensive view of our financial position, and have full means of measuring the policy which we ought to adopt. Let me now recall to the recollection of the Committee the fact that our fiscal situation—to borrow a phrase from our neighbours on the other side of the Channel—as it stands is this. There is a deficit of £9,400,000, the best means of providing for which

it becomes our duty to consider ; and we ought not, in my opinion, to face a question of such magnitude as is now before us, without having duly weighed the principles upon which we are to proceed, and the policy on which we mean to act. Now I have already indicated to you a summary budget which might have the effect of filling up the hiatus which I have mentioned. I have also shadowed out to you another and a more generous budget, which, providing you with an income tax of 1s. in the pound, would achieve the same object, and would enable you to relieve the consumers of tea and sugar to the extent of the remaining portions of the war duty ; as well as that more niggardly budget, which would keep up the duties on tea and sugar, and would still leave the country liable to an income tax of 9*d.* in the pound. With what views, then, and upon what principles, are we to face this state of circumstances, I may at once venture to state frankly that I am not satisfied with the state of the public expenditure, and the rapid rate of its growth. I trust, therefore, that we mean in a great degree to retrace our steps. The process of retracing our steps in such a matter, however, even were it resolved upon and begun, is one which must necessarily be gradual ; for, if it be not pursued with circumspection and with caution, it will serve but to aggravate the very evils which it may be intended to remove. I assume, therefore, whether the Committee concurs with the Government in the expediency of the Estimates which they have submitted, or are about to submit to the House, or whether it does not, that you can effect no radical change in the scale of that expenditure on which you have now, for a series of years, embarked—no radical change, I mean, applicable to the operations of the present year, or to the provision you will have to make for filling up the gap which yawns before you, and which is represented by the figures £9,400,000. The real question with which we have to deal is whether we ought upon this occasion to say our necessities are great, our means too narrow, to enable us to effect any commercial reforms. Such reforms are all very well, it may be contended, for fine weather, but they do not suit a period of pressure and alarm. That is, I know, a favourite doctrine with some classes, but against the justice of that doctrine I for one protest. And upon the part of the Government I do not hesitate to say that, at an epoch so marked and signal in our financial history as the year 1860, it is their opinion that it is the duty of Parliament to take some steps in advance in that career

of commercial improvement which, perhaps, more than any other cause, has contributed to confirm the prosperity of the country, and the security of its institutions, under the auspices of the Sovereign under whose rule it is our happiness to live.

There are in the present year special reasons why we should pursue such a policy as that to which I refer. The first of these I find in the cessation of the Long Annuities. Are we to be told that when a sum of £2,000,000 and upwards annually, which we have hitherto been obliged to pay on the national debt, comes into our possession, it only remains for us to cast it into that great gulf of expenditure, there to be swallowed up and to disappear? That sum is a mighty engine for the purposes of relief, while for the purposes of expenditure, such as expenditure is now, it is comparatively unimportant. Applied to the purposes of relief, you may by its means shed a thousand blessings over the land; thrown into the scale of your expenditure it represents, after all, but the difference between the £13,000,000 which you have already added to that expenditure and the £11,000,000 which you might have added. The next of these reasons is to be found in the state of the tea and sugar duties. They have continued to be levied for three years at a rate exceeding that which was fixed for a time of peace, and this even while the income tax was allowed to sink to 5*d*. I do not say that we are bound to choose these particular duties for reduction unless we find that a reduction of them will be the best of all the reductions that may be within our choice; but I do confidently urge that the position of these duties offers a strong reason why we should endeavour to afford on this occasion a considerable relief, and give attention to the claims of the people, as well as to the claims of trade, on which the prosperity of all classes mainly depends. There is yet another special reason. It is my intention before sitting down to propose to the Committee that they shall apply in aid of the expenditure of the year a sum of not less than £1,400,000, which is no part of the proposed taxation of the year, but which will be obtained by rendering available another portion of the malt credit, and the credit usually given on hops. That may, under our present circumstances, be a salutary measure; but if we are employing in aid of the year extraordinary resources which form no part of its public burdens, that is a reason why we should also include in its arrangements special benefits, and make use of the means

thus supplied for carrying forward the great work of public improvement.

But, Sir, I am not satisfied to place this duty on narrow grounds of whatever kind. It is not simply because annuities are falling in—it is not simply because we have considerable funds to be drawn from this source or that. We must look at the question from another point of view. We must take it for granted that for the present we have attained to what may be called a high level of public expenditure, and that we are likely to remain on that high level for some time at least. Is that a reason, or is it not, why we should arrest the process of reforming the commercial legislation of the country? I say that is no reason for stopping—I say more, it is a distinct reason for persevering in that process and carrying it boldly and readily to its completion. Let us, however, glance for a moment at our position. If we were, in the year 1860, to hold our hands, let us consider what aspect our procedure would bear. For seven years under the pressure of war and of demands for increased expenditure, we have intermitted the course of commercial improvement on which we had entered: we have now arrived at a year of unexampled financial relief as regards the charge of the public debt, a year of which the Ways and Means will be enlarged by special resources, and a year which obliges us to reconsider the existing duties on tea and sugar. If, after such a period of years, on a review of a juncture like the present, we stop in 1860, will it not be supposed that we stop for ever? In truth, if this be not a fitting opportunity for endeavouring to give increased effect to the beneficial principles of your legislation, I, for one, must frankly own I know not when such an opportunity will arise. But, Sir, I come now to the broader view of the truth of the case. Our high taxation is not a reason for stopping short in our commercial reforms; it is a reason why we should persevere in them. For it is by means of these reforms that we are enabled to bear high taxation. What, I ask, has the country done during the last six months? It has paid an income tax, which, during the half-year, was at the rate of 1s. 1d. in the pound. Would that tax, so suddenly imposed, have been borne as it has been borne without discontent, but for the strength which the country has derived from the recent commercial legislation? In stating that this great and sudden augmentation of the income tax has been borne without discontent—(AN HON. MEMBER: “Hear, hear!”)—I speak in general

terms. Indeed, I now remember that I myself had, about a fortnight ago, a letter addressed to me, complaining of the monstrous injustice and iniquity of the income tax, and proposing that, in consideration thereof, the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be publicly hanged. Of course I do not mean to say there has in no individual case been a murmur; but, upon the whole, speaking with the necessary latitude that must attach to general expressions, I am justified in saying that this high rate of taxation has been borne throughout the country with a most extraordinary, laudable, and honourable forbearance. It was, I think, Lord Londonderry who complained of the people of England as exhibiting an "ignorant impatience of taxation"; but I think, were he to rise from the dead and again take his place in this House, he would be very much more likely to describe them as distinguished by an ignorant patience of taxation.

I wish, however, Sir, to show more particularly the connexion that subsists between commercial reforms, as affecting trade and industry, and the power to pay the high taxes you have imposed. These two subjects are inseparably locked the one in the other. You shall have the demonstration in figures. I again ask you for a moment to attend with me to the experience of two periods. I take the ten years from 1832, the crisis of the Reform Bill, down to 1841 during which our commercial legislation was, upon the whole, stationary; and I take the twelve years from 1842 to 1853, within the circuit of which are comprehended the beneficial changes that Parliament has made. In the ten years from 1832 to 1841 this was the state of things:— You imposed of Customs and Excise duties £2,067,000, and you remitted £3,385,000, exhibiting a balance remitted over and above what you imposed of £1,317,000, or at the rate of no more than £131,000 a year. Now, observe the effect on the state of the revenue. During these ten years the Customs and Excise increased by £1,707,000, or at the rate of £170,000 a year; while the increase of the export trade was £15,156,000, or at the annual rate of £1,515,000. Let us next take the twelve years from 1842 to 1853. You remitted during that period of Customs and Excise £13,238,000, and imposed £1,029,000, presenting a balance remitted of £12,209,000, or an annual average of £1,017,000. What was the effect on the revenue? The Customs and Excise increased £2,656,000, or at an annual rate of £221,000. When you remitted practically nothing, your Customs revenue, in consequence of the increase of the population, grew at the rate

of £170,000 per annum ; and when you remitted £1,017,000 a year, your Customs and Excise revenue grew faster than when you remitted nothing, or next to nothing at all. I ask, is not this a conclusive proof that it is the relaxation and reform of your commercial system which has given to the country the disposition to pay taxes along with the power also which it now possesses to support them ? The foreign trade of the country, during the same period, instead of growing at the rate of £1,515,000 a year, grew at the rate of £4,304,000. I say, then, Sir, without hesitation, that it is the duty of the Legislature, both on account of the special circumstances of the juncture, and likewise, and still more, on the broad ground of general and comprehensive principle, at this time to make considerable remissions ; and if that be so, the next question is on what principle you should make them.

When we have arrived at this stage of the question, the subject of the tea and sugar duties may naturally occur to the mind of every one as having a presumptive claim, at any rate, to the first consideration. I am bound, however, to say that these are not the subjects on which it has appeared to the Government that they might operate with the greatest advantage. No doubt the duties on tea and sugar are taxes most desirable to be reduced. They are harmless and beneficial articles—articles of universal consumption, and I trust the time may arrive, and arrive at no distant date, when we may be able to recur to our former standard in regard to these taxes. But, on the other hand, there never was a time when the people were so well able to pay these taxes as now. The increase in the consumption of these articles is regular, and the revenue is a growing revenue. If we are to have a very large scale of expenditure and a very high income tax, I cannot think, while the bulk of the burden should fall on the shoulders of those having property, that it is otherwise than desirable that the labouring classes should bear their share of the burden in a form in which it will be palpable and intelligible to them, rather than in forms in which it will be veiled from their eyes. But, Sir, I take my stand more especially on this consideration ; the duties on tea and sugar, whatever else they may be, are simply revenue duties. They entail no complexity in the system of Customs law ; above all, they entail none of the evils that belong to differential duties ; and I will by-and-by invite you to join the Government in adopting measures whereby you will be able to counteract and

root out evils of that peculiar and aggravated kind, as well as to give relief in the price of commodities. But I do not hesitate to say that it is a mistake to suppose that the best mode of giving benefit to the labouring classes is simply to operate on the articles consumed by them. If you want to do them the *maximum* of good, you should rather operate on the articles which give them the *maximum* of employment. What is it that has brought about the great change in their position of late years? Not that you have legislated here and there, taking off 1*d.* or 2*d.* in the pound of some article consumed by the labouring classes. This is good as far as it goes, but it is not this which has been mainly operative in bettering their condition as it has been bettered during the last ten or fifteen years. It is that you have set more free the general course of trade; it is that you have put in action the process that gives them the widest field and the highest rate of remuneration for their labour. Take the great change in the corn laws; it may even possibly be doubted whether up to this time you have given them cheaper bread—at best it is but a trifle cheaper than before; that change, however, is one comparatively immaterial; but you have created a regular and steady trade which may be stated at £15,000,000 a year; by that trade you have created a corresponding demand for the commodities of which they are the producers, their labour being an essential and principal element in their production, and it is the price their labour thus brings, not the price of cheapened commodities, that forms the main benefit they receive. That is the principle of a sound political economy applicable to commercial legislation, and that is the principle on which we will to-night invite you to proceed.

I may simply state, therefore, in passing, in regard to the tea and sugar duties, that we shall ask Parliament to renew them,—not to renew them for any lengthened period, but only for one year, with the further addition of three months till July, 1861; an addition for which we shall ask on the simple ground that the 1st of April is an inconvenient period, as it restricts too much the time within which Parliament has to consider the question.

SIR J. PAKINGTON: You propose to leave the duties as they are?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I mean to ask for the duties precisely as they now stand; that is, 1*s.* 5*d.* per pound on tea, and the duties on sugar which are classified at various rates on the various descriptions, but which may be

represented on the whole as being about 3s. the cwt., above the *minimum* point at which they stood fixed in 1853.

Having thus far stated to the Committee the conviction of the Government that we ought to have remissions, and large remissions of duty—and further that we ought to have those particular remissions in preference to all others by which we may most effectually act upon the trade and commerce of the country, and upon the demand for the labour of the people—I come now to the question of the commercial treaty with France. And, Sir, I will confidently recommend the adoption of the treaty to the House, as fulfilling and satisfying all the conditions of the most beneficial kind of change in our commercial legislation.

But, perhaps, Sir, as the Committee has not yet had an opportunity of reading the treaty, it may be convenient that I should in the first place state to them very briefly its principal covenants. First, I will take the engagements of France. France engages to reduce the duty on English coal and coke from the 1st of July, 1860 ; on bar and pig-iron and steel from the 1st of October, 1860 ; on tools and machinery from the 1st of December, 1860 ; and on yarns and goods in flax and hemp, including I believe jute,—an article comparatively new in commerce, but one in which a great and very just interest is felt in some important districts,—from the 1st of June, 1861. That is the first important covenant into which France enters. Her second and great engagement is postponed to the 1st of October, 1861. I think it is probably in the knowledge of the Committee that this postponement is stipulated under a pledge given by the Government of France to the classes who suppose themselves to be interested in the maintenance of prohibition. On the 1st of October, then, in the year 1861, France engages to reduce the duties and to take away the prohibitions on all the articles of British production mentioned in a certain list, in such a way that no duty upon any of those articles shall exceed 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. I do not speak of articles of food, which do not materially enter into the treaty ; but the list to which I refer, Sir, includes all the staples of British manufacture, whether of yarns, flax, hemp, hair, wool, silk, or cotton—all manufactures of skins, leather, bark, wood, iron and all other metals, glass, stoneware, earthenware, and porcelain. I will not go through the whole list, but I am not aware of any great or material article that is omitted. France also engages to commute these

*ad valorem* duties into rated duties by a separate convention. But if there should be a disagreement as to the terms on which they shall be rated under the convention, then the *maximum*, chargeable on every class at 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, will be levied at the proper period, not in the form of rated duty, but upon the value, and the value will be determined by the process now in use in the English Customs. That is to say, the importer will declare the value, and it will be in the option of the Custom-house authorities in France to appropriate the article upon paying the price which he has declared, with a per centage added. And I must say that I hold it to be a signal proof of earnestness and liberality on the part of the French Government that it has introduced this administrative regulation into its code, borrowed, as I believe, from our own, for the purpose of disarming suspicion and insuring the efficacious execution of the treaty. There is a further provision, Sir, that the *maximum* of 30 per cent. shall, after a period not exceeding three years, be reduced to a *maximum* of 25 per cent.

And I may be permitted to remind the Committee that this rule of 30 per cent., to which France is nominally about to pass from a system of prohibition, is the very rule which was adopted, nominally adopted, by the British Parliament when Mr. Huskisson was our Minister for trade, and when we first set about making important commercial relaxations. But there is, I am bound to say, this difference between the two cases—that the rule was accompanied in England with such modes of operation that duties far exceeding 30 per cent. were, in a multitude of instances, nay, are in many instances to this day, kept alive; whereas, as far as the terms of this instrument go, France has, I think, given us a security that 30 per cent. will really be the *maximum*. And I need hardly observe that if this be the *maximum*, then, with a system of rated duties, it must happen that, in a great multitude of instances, the duties will be much below that rate on many classes of our manufactured goods.

I come next, Sir, to the English covenants. England engages, with a limited power of exception, which we propose to exercise with respect only to two or three articles, to abolish immediately and totally all duties upon all manufactured goods. There will be a sweep, clean, entire, and absolute, of manufactured goods from the face of the British tariff. She engages to reduce the duty on brandy from 15s. per gallon to the level of the colonial duty—namely, 8s. 2d. per gallon. She engages to reduce

immediately the duty on foreign wine. In the Treaty it is, of course, French wine which is specified ; but it is perfectly understood between France and ourselves that we proceed with regard to the commodities of all countries alike. England engages, then, to reduce the duty on wine from a rate nearly reaching 5s. 10d. to 3s. per gallon. She engages further to reduce that duty from the 1st of April, 1861, to a scale which has reference to the strength of the wine as measured by the quantity of spirit it contains. That scale is as follows :—On all wines in bottles, whatever the strength, and on all wines having 26 degrees and upwards of proof spirit, 2s. per gallon ; on wine having 15 and under 26 degrees of proof, 1s. 6d. per gallon ; and on wine with less than 15 degrees, 1s. per gallon. The *maximum* of 40 degrees, beyond which no liquid is admissible as wine, will remain without change. A power is also reserved to us of increasing our duty on wine in case we should increase our duty of Excise chargeable on spirits. We have also reserved a general power of augmenting or imposing duty upon purely fiscal considerations. The exercise of this power is subject to the condition that we shall not charge upon any article of French production a greater sum than may be equal to the corresponding duty on the same article of domestic production, together with an allowance for any extra and further charges to which the English producer may be put in consequence of the necessary regulations of our Inland Revenue Department.

These, Sir, are the chief covenants on the part of England. There are also provisions by which both parties reserve to themselves power to place Customs duties anew on any foreign articles whatsoever, provided they place the same duties on the like articles of domestic production. They likewise agree to treat each other as the most favoured nations with respect to all the matters comprised in the Treaty, and with respect to all prohibitions. Lastly, all the articles of the Treaty are to continue in operation for a period of ten years, with a provision as to giving notice of any desire for their revision.

These, then, are the principal stipulations of the Treaty with France, which may have been seen by hon. Members in one form or another, but which have not collectively, or upon authority, as yet met the public eye. I will not affect to be unaware that many objections have been stated to this Treaty. It has even been said that its terms indicate a subserviency to France, and involve a sacrifice of British interests to those of foreign nations or of a foreign Government. Sir, I am thankful to think

that no Ministry, be its own merits or be the distinction of its chief what they may, can in this country hold office for a single Session upon terms of subserviency to any foreign Power whatever. There is here a perfect security (to omit all mention of any other guarantees) in the nature and in the traditions of the two Houses of Parliament. But, Sir, I know not what is meant by subserviency to France as regards the articles of a Treaty like this. We have given to France in the proper sense of the term, nothing by this Treaty, if I accept some very trifling fiscal sacrifice which we are to make with respect to the single article of brandy. I mean that it might not be necessary to reduce the duty to quite so low a point as is fixed by the Treaty, and therefore there might be a question whether some infinitesimal advantage may not be surrendered in that form. But, with that small, and I believe solitary exception, we have given nothing to France by this Treaty which we have not given with as liberal a hand to ourselves. And the changes here proposed are changes every one of which deserves the acceptance of this House on its own merits, in conformity with all the principles that have been recognized and acted upon for many years past.

But further, Sir, as respects the charge of subserviency to France, I know that this Treaty may be said to bear a political character. The commercial relations of England with France have always borne a political character. What is the history of the system of prohibitions on the one side and on the other which grew up between this country and France? It was simply this:—That finding yourselves in political estrangement from her at the time of the Revolution, you followed up and confirmed that estrangement, both on the one side and the other, by a system of prohibitory duties. And I do not deny that it was effectual for its end. I do not mean for its economical end. Economically it may, I admit, have been detrimental enough to both countries; but for its political end it was effectual. And because it was effectual I call upon you to legislate now for an opposite end by the exact reverse of that process. And if you desire to knit together in amity those two great nations whose conflicts have often shaken the world, undo for your purpose that which your fathers did for their purpose, and pursue with equal intelligence and consistency an end that is more beneficial. Sir, there was once a time when close relations of amity were established between the Government of England

and France. It was in the reign of the later Stuarts ; and it marks a dark spot in our annals, because it was an union formed in a spirit of domineering ambition on the one side, and of base and vile subserviency on the other. But that, Sir, was not an union of the nations ; it was an union of the Governments. This is not to be an union of the Governments ; it is to be an union of the nations ; and I confidently say again, as I have already ventured to say in this House, that there never can be any union between the nations of England and France except an union beneficial to the world, because directly either the one or the other begins to harbour schemes of selfish aggrandizement, that moment the jealousy of its neighbour will powerfully react, and the very fact of their being in harmony will of itself be at all times the most conclusive proof that neither of them can meditate anything which is dangerous to Europe.

There is another class of objections of which I do not complain, but which I hope to remove. There are those who say that a commercial treaty is an abandonment of the principles of free trade. Well, certainly a commercial treaty would be the abandonment of the principles of free trade, in the latitude in which we now employ that phrase, if it involved the recognition of exclusive privileges. In this sense I admit that Mr. Pitt's commercial treaty would, if we had now adopted it in the terms in which it was expressed, have been on our part an abandonment of free trade, but, at the same time, I cannot mention that treaty without saying that I think it was, for the time at which it was made, one of the best and one of the wisest measures ever adopted by Parliament, and has contributed at least as much as any other passage of his brilliant career to the fame of the great statesman who concluded it. We, however, have no exclusive engagements ; we have not the pretence of an exclusive engagement. France is perfectly aware that our legislation makes no distinction between one nation and another, and that what we enact for her we shall at the same time enact for all the world.

I am, however, a little surprised at the number and variety of these objections which come rushing from all quarters. It is like the ancient explanation of the physical cause of a storm—all the winds, north, east, west, and south, rushing together :—

“ *Una Eurusque Notusque ruunt, crebreque procellis Africus.*” Sometimes a treaty is an obsolete and antiquated idea ; sometimes it is a dangerous innovation. In the view of one class it is an abandonment of free trade. There are also another class

of men, of opinions diametrically at variance with these, and those are gentlemen with whom we shall have much difficulty in dealing. These are they who find fault with it—and that I must say is by far the soundest objection, inasmuch as it is unquestionably founded on the facts—because it is an abandonment of the principle of protection. This treaty is an abandonment of the principle of protection. I am not aware of any entangling engagement which it contains; it certainly contains no exclusive privilege, but it is an abandonment of the principle of protection, and a means, I hope complete and efficacious, of sweeping from the statute book the chief relics of that miscalled system which still remain upon it. The fact is, and you will presently see that it is so, that our old friend Protection, who used formerly to dwell in the palaces of the land, and who was dislodged from them some ten or fifteen years ago, has since that period found very comfortable shelter and good living in holes and corners; and you are now invited, if you will have the goodness to concur in the operation, to see whether you cannot likewise eject from him those holes and corners. I told you that we are to remove the duty from all manufactured goods. Now, Sir, there is hardly one of that class of duties which is not, in point of fact, the representative of a strictly protective duty; nay more—and mark my words—in many cases of a prohibitory duty.

Perhaps the best method of giving a summary view of the case will be by my stating to the Committee what will be the financial results of the treaty as it stands. I will not enter into any of the smaller details, and will take three branches of reduction only—the reduction of the duty upon wine, the reduction of that upon brandy, and the abolition of the duties upon manufactured goods. The reduction of the duty upon wine from 5s. 10d. to 3s. per gallon will afford to the consumer a relief of £830,000, and will entail upon the revenue, after allowing for an increase of consumption to the extent of 35 per cent., a loss of £515,000. The reduction of the duty upon brandy from 15s. to 8s. 2d. a gallon will give to the consumer a relief of £446,000, and, assuming that the consumption will be raised to the point at which it stood in 1850, just before the disease of the vine commenced, it will cause a loss of £225,000 to the revenue. Before I give the chief items of manufactured goods I will mention some minor cases, with which we propose to deal for the time as exceptions. There are three small articles the abolition of the

duties on which we propose to postpone for a short period, in the meantime reducing it by one-half. One of them is the article cork, which has been the subject of a great deal of debate in this House. I must say that although there never was a stronger apparent case made out for protection, and although, in consequence of the measures which were adopted, there has been a considerable shock to the trade, and a considerable change of its nature and of the course which it takes, the House has nothing to repent. On the contrary, the total consumption of cork wood in the domestic manufacture is much larger now than it was before the duty was reduced. On account of the importance of the present change, however, we propose to give until the 1st of April, 1861, for the reduction of the duty on cork; and we also propose a delay of the changes affecting two other trades, upon the simple ground that they are trades carried on almost entirely by widely-diffused rural labour, to which it is not desirable to give a sudden shock. These are the glove trade and the trade in straw-plaiting. In the meantime the duties will be reduced, and next year they will be taken off.

I pass now to state the mode in which the treaty deals with manufactured goods in general. The amount of duty on these articles, which will be abolished, is no less than £432,000. The principal articles are silk manufactures, £270,000; gloves, subject to a short delay, £48,000; artificial flowers, £20,000; watches, £15,000; certain oils, £10,000; musical instruments, £9,000; leather, £9,000; china, £8,000; glass, £7,000, and many others yielding smaller amounts. There are a great number of minor articles of industry produced largely in France, especially in Paris. The total relief to the consumer—that is the gross amount of duty remitted under the French treaty—will be £1,737,000; the loss to the revenue for the first year will probably be £1,190,000. Now, Sir, the objections which are taken to this treaty in the interests of Free Trade will not, I am quite sure, be very long-lived; but there is one objection which turns upon another point, and with which I must endeavour to deal. It is that which tells us that the duties we are about to repeal are, forsooth, revenue duties, and duties which are levied upon luxuries, but which do not affect the poor man. Compassion for the poor man is a very fine feeling, and I should be very sorry to say anything that appeared to depreciate or undervalue so sacred a sentiment, but I must say that it is entirely out of place here. There is not one of these duties that is a

revenue duty—no, not one of them. How they work with respect to poor men, how they work with respect to those who are not rich men, we will presently inquire. But if these are revenue duties, it is very curious to notice which are the classes that are alarmed at the treaty. Are the manufacturers of British brandy the guardians of the British revenue? Are the importers of Cape wines the guardians of British revenue? Have the manufacturers of British wines a peculiar interest in the well-being of the exchequer? The manufacturers of Spitalfields, and those of Coventry, who have an incomparable organ in my right hon. friend,<sup>1</sup> are most excellent citizens, and no doubt contribute their share to the revenue; but my right hon. friend will not tell me that their great activity, their speed in rushing up to London, and urging their representations upon this subject, has arisen from their interest in the British revenue. It has arisen from something very different. These gentlemen do not enter my room to tell me that they come there as the guardians of the British revenue; they tell a much more simple and a much more intelligible tale. They say this—that the duties which now stand upon your tariff are, and it is perfectly true, levied upon articles consumed by the rich. But why are they not levied upon articles consumed by the middle, the lower middle class and the poor? Because they will not let them in; because they are prohibitory as against those articles. That is the explanation of the whole case. Our manufacturers give over to France the highest qualities under cover of duties, which are as good for their purpose as prohibitions, and reserve for themselves the making of the lower qualities, and the power of exacting from the British consumer a higher price than they will be able to obtain if this treaty is confirmed by Parliament. I took the liberty of saying to one of the deputations, “It seems to me this is much the case of the corn law over again.” Now do not let there be any mistake. What is wanted is, a higher price than that at which the public can get goods from France. That is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end of it. I asked then, “Is not this the case of the corn law?” The answer was, “Oh dear, no, not the least like the corn law.” In fact, there is generally, on the part of the most respectable classes, a desire for the protection of their own business. They show that though they are without exception adherents of free trade, they are not adherents of free trade without exception. They

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Ellice.

make no secret of it, nor should there by any secret made of it here, that the duties in which they take an interest are not revenue duties but are protection duties, and, therefore, duties ill adapted for the purposes of revenue.

Let us now, Sir, proceed to consider some of the circumstances which have rendered it allowable and desirable, in the view of Her Majesty's advisers, to make a special arrangement in this case. I entreat the Committee to look at the present state of the trade between England and France; it is not a little instructive. Consider, in the first place, the relative positions of England and France. It is perfectly true that France is a foreign country, but she is a foreign country separated from you absolutely by a narrower channel than that which divides you from Ireland; and while nature, or Providence rather, has placed you in the closest proximity, it has also given to these two great countries such diversities of soil, climate, products, and character, that I do not believe you can find, on the face of the world, two other countries which are so constituted for carrying on a beneficial and extended commerce. I believe, indeed, that the prohibitory system subsisting between England and France is but little less unnatural as to every commercial—I think I may add as to every moral and political—result than if you were to revive those prohibitory systems which formerly separated England from Scotland, and Great Britain from Ireland. I shall be told, perhaps, that our system is not prohibitory. And certainly in respect of many articles the statement is a true one, for we have considerable importations from France; but when I remember how much we still practically prohibit, I have no hesitation in saying that, although our system is far better than that of France, yet, on the other hand, it is far indeed from being what it ought to be. And now let us look for a moment at the question on the French side. The doctrine is that we should attend to our own interests, and leave France to manage hers. What, then, is the state of the trade as regards France? In 1858 the total value of exports from England to France—not British exports only, but exports of whatever origin—was £14,821,000. Of that amount the home consumption in France took £10,465,000. A portion of the articles are unenumerated, and I cannot get at the details, but I have obtained the particulars of articles to the value of £9,819,000, about nineteen-twentieths of the whole. Observe how they are distributed. Of this large proportion of the goods sent to France

in 1858, amounting to £9,819,000, raw materials, upon which no labour whatever has been employed, and the great bulk of which were not of British origin, but merely passed through our warehouses, were £8,070,000, and half-manufactured articles were £1,060,000. The total amount of manufactures which we send abroad every year is about £130,000,000; but in 1858 our exports of manufactured goods to France were only £688,000. It is worth while to go yet one step further in the analysis. Of that £688,000, £208,000 were for Cashmere shawls, which merely came here in transit, and £217,000 for machinery, which our friends over the water have been pleased to admit under some notion of special advantage. The value of all the other manufactured articles sent from the United Kingdom to France was £263,000. I want to know whether that is a state of things so satisfactory that when we have an opportunity of amending it we should refuse to do so. I understand the statement of the moderate Free Trader who says that half a loaf is better than no bread, that all breaking down of restrictions is good, and that it is wiser to break down our own restrictions and leave those of our neighbour standing if we cannot touch them than to perpetuate both. That is true and reasonable; but I cannot understand those immoderate and unmanageable Free Traders who come from other quarters, many of whom have not long been thus fastidious and jealous on behalf of free trade in its most rigid purity, and who seem to think it is a positive evil to induce our neighbours to break down their restrictions. They do not see that what they condemn is a doubling of the benefit. They think there is a chivalry in free trade, which is degraded if it becomes a matter of bargain, whereas it appears to me that bargain is really the true end and aim of the whole. The only reason why we have not made bargains similar to the present in former years was simply because we could not make them. It was not for want of trying. For four or five years this was almost the chief business of one or more departments of the State, and yet no progress could be made. Why? Because they set out upon a false principle—the principle that the concessions which each party made to the other were not a benefit but an injury to itself. We have not proceeded upon that principle. We have never pretended to France that we were going to inflict injury upon ourselves. We have offered France our best aid in breaking down her own vicious prohibitory system. In doing so, we may have given a greater benefit to

France than to ourselves. I shall not attempt to measure it on one side or the other. What we have done is good—nay, doubly good—good for ourselves if France had done nothing at all, doubly good because France has done a great deal. And now, Sir, one word upon our exports to France at a former period. About twenty years ago there was a trade in English manufactured goods with France. It was in linen and linen yarns. In 1842 we greatly reduced our table of Customs duties, not by treaty, and independently of France, but in such a manner as greatly to extend our trade. How did that country reply to us? France was under a very friendly Government at that time, but how did she meet the immense changes we had made in favour of her commerce? She met it by smiting this single branch of trade in British manufactures with prohibitory duties. She raised her duties upon linen yarn, which before 1842 had been from 9 to 12 per cent., to from 13 to 27 per cent. Her duties upon linen cloths, which before 1842 had been from 15 to 23 per cent., were increased to from 20 to 36 per cent. The result may be anticipated. In 1841 we sent to France linen and linen yarns to the amount of £1,090,127, whereas in 1858 we sent only £151,483. Such is the state of trade between England and France; and I confess I am not so well satisfied with it as not to think that it admits of some improvement. As an hon. friend whom I see opposite said the other day with respect to our wine duties, so I say of our trade with France, it is not in “the best” possible state, but, on the contrary, might be amended with advantage.

I have promised, however, to show what is the real meaning of the allegation urged against the treaty that we are here dealing with revenue duties. Take the article of brandy. I presume nobody will pretend that a duty of 15s. upon French brandy, compared with a duty of 8s. on British spirits, is a revenue duty. There is indeed an article manufactured in this country which some of us may have been happy or unhappy enough to taste. It is called British brandy. In consequence of the immense price to which French brandy is raised by our duty, which has the effect not only of raising the price of the best French brandies, but of excluding entirely everything but the superior French brandies, our middling and indifferent British brandy comes into the place which is kept empty for it by means of the prohibitory power of our duty. As far as brandy is concerned, therefore, we are not dealing with revenue duties. Can we, then, regard

the duties upon silk and wine as revenue duties ? The mystery of the wine duty is a very deep one. Here especially we are met by the cry that wine is the rich man's luxury. It is the rich man's luxury, but I shall show presently that those who are not rich are making desperate struggles to get at it, and that, too, with some limited and qualified success, but under grievous discouragement. But wine, forsooth, is the rich man's luxury. Is tea the rich man's luxury ? No. It is the poor man's, and, above all, the poor woman's luxury. But I speak in the year 1860. In 1760, tea, too, was the rich man's luxury. In 1760 there was no more tea consumed per head of the population than there is wine now. In 1760 there were 4,000,000 lb. of tea consumed ; now the annual consumption is 76,000,000 lb. The price of tea which is now sold at 3s. per lb. was somewhere about that time advertised by the cheap houses at £1 per lb. Wine is the rich man's luxury, and you may make tea, or sugar, or any other article of consumption, the rich man's luxury if you put on it a sufficient weight of duty. By that means you will not only effectually bar the access of the poor man to it, but will reserve to yourselves the proud satisfaction of saying with literal truth, " Our indirect taxes are paid by the rich ; none are levied upon articles consumed by the poor."

Let us consider now the necessary operations upon an article like wine of a uniform rate of duty. Wine, I suppose, more than almost anything else that is produced by the labour of man, varies in quality and price. It is not too much to say that the price of wine runs from 1 up to 100. Upon all qualities we lay the same rate of duty. What is the effect ? That we tax even the highest wines somewhat heavily ; the next to the highest we tax very heavily indeed, and all except those limited classes we in effect totally and absolutely prohibit. Let me give one illustration from a simpler case than that of wine, which very clearly explains how this matter stands, and let me thus dispose, once for all, of the notion that we are dealing with revenue duties, laid upon the luxuries of a class, and not upon articles wanted for the consumption of the poor. It is the very simple case of gloves, which was stated to me by a most intelligent and respectable deputation, who, as became them, made no secret at all about the matter. Our import duty upon gloves is 3s. 8d. a dozen. We imported in 1859 about 300,000 dozen. The value of the gloves we import is about 24s. a dozen wholesale ; the retail price of such articles probably ranges from 30s. to 36s. and

upwards. Our duty is something like 15 per cent., which seems very moderate, and enables those who are so disposed to say, "Ah! we do not discourage the importation of French gloves; we merely lay upon them a duty of 15 per cent., simply for the sake of revenue." How does this work? It works in this way, that it causes the French to furnish us with the finer qualities of gloves, while they leave to the British producer the supply of the poorer qualities. Abolish the duty, and you will find that a quantity of gloves would be imported from France, Naples, Germany, and Belgium. They will not be gloves at 24s. a dozen, but gloves at 18s., 15s., 10s., and even, as I am informed, at 6s. a dozen. These lesser-priced gloves cannot pay the duty, for the duty when applied to gloves of 10s. a dozen is 37 per cent., and when applied to gloves of 6s. per dozen is 58 per cent.; and those gentlemen, whose words I heard with implicit belief, told me distinctly that if this duty were removed a large quantity of gloves would be imported here at 10s. and 12s. the dozen. Therefore the duty is not a revenue duty, but it is a protective duty on the higher qualities, while as regards the bulk of the trade, and as regards the bulk of the British consumers, it is to every practical intent and purpose a duty not of protection but of prohibition. Even so it is with the wine duties. Is that doubted? Let us then see how the wine duties operate as a system of protection. We have heard of Cape wine, and if we visit places much frequented by what may be termed the lower middle classes we see advertisements representing large tuns surrounded by jovial people, with the words Cape port and African sherry written on them. In all probability that is not Cape port or African sherry. Some of those who import Cape port and African sherry know how to make a better use of them. There is a system of promotion and preferment in wines. The African wines are used for mixing with foreign European wines, and, to employ language familiar to my right hon. friend the Secretary for War,<sup>1</sup> *vice* the African wine promoted, some new composts are brought forward and delivered to a discerning public, with what results it is not for me to say. The colonial wine has a differential duty in its favour of nearly 3s. a gallon; and if there really be this great care for the revenue from wine, I beseech those who feel that anxiety to go along with us in reforming the wine duties; for they will find that the decrease in the receipt of duty from year to year would, apart from any treaty with France, but from fiscal considerations, com-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Sidney Herbert.

pel them in the course of a few years to reform the wine duties.

To afford the proof of what I have just stated, I take for each period of three years, during the last nine years, the consumption of foreign wine and Cape wine in the United Kingdom. The average of foreign wine consumed in the three years, 1851-3, was 6,225,000 gallons. During the same period the average consumption of colonial wine was 254,000 gallons. In the period of 1854-56 the average consumption of foreign wine was 6,393,000 gallons, being an increase of 168,000 gallons over the previous period. It is worthy of notice that this increase took place when the disease of the vine was at its worst; and I mention this particularly, because, as this represents the consumption of foreign wine during the disease, it shows that the increase which has taken place in the consumption of Cape wine cannot be owing to the disease in the European grape. When that disease was at its worst the consumption of foreign wine increased, as I have already stated, by 168,000 gallons; the average consumption of Cape wine during the same period—1854-1856—rose from 254,000 gallons to 298,000 gallons. During the latest term of years—1857-59—the disease of the vine was very much mitigated, but the average consumption of foreign wine showed a decrease of 500,000 gallons as compared with the consumption of 1854-56. The average consumption of foreign wine in 1857-59 was 5,893,000 gallons, while the consumption of the colonial wine had increased by no less than 357,000 gallons, the average consumption in this last period being 655,000 gallons, more than double the consumption of the former triennial period. The colonial wine is, in fact, rapidly displacing the foreign. The present duty is purely a protecting and differential duty, and is hostile to the revenue of this country.

But, besides wine imported from a colony, there is another element affecting the wine revenue, and that is the manufacture of what is called British wine. While the consumption of foreign wine has fallen from an average of 6,225,000 gallons to 5,893,000 gallons, there has been an increase in the manufacture of British wine. British wine—I mean that in the hands of highly respectable manufacturers, and I am not referring at all to what is sold for fraudulent purposes—is made very much with raisins, sugar and brandy. The duty paid on these materials is reckoned as amounting to 1s. 2d. a gallon. Therefore you have a duty on foreign wine of 5s. 10d. the gallon, on colonial wine of 2s. 11d. the gallon, and on British wine of 1s. 2d. the gallon. The result

is that the consumption of foreign wine diminishes, the consumption of colonial wine has increased, and the consumption of British wine has doubled within the last ten years. This case, then, has all the essential characteristics of a trade carried on, and a revenue pinning, under the influence of differential duties. I therefore say that the present wine duty is a protective and differential duty with respect to the three classes which enter into our consumption, namely, foreign, colonial, and British wines, they all paying different rates of duty to the revenue.

Out of the enormous quantity of foreign wine manufactured abroad, no doubt it is true that only a small fraction would become available in this country. The great bulk is a wine which an Englishman would not take in exchange for his beer ; but it is also true that between that common and coarse wine and the fine wines there are ten thousand intermediate shades, and there is an immense capacity for producing wines fitted for the English market and for the taste of the middle and lower middle classes in this country, which capacity is at present entirely stifled by the operation of the wine duty.

There is a notion gone abroad that there is something fixed and unchanging in an Englishman's taste with respect to wine. You find a great number of people in this country who believe, like an article of Christian faith, that an Englishman is not born to drink French wines. Do what you will, they say ; argue with him as you will ; reduce your duties as you will ; endeavour even to pour the French wine down his throat, but still he will reject it. Well, these are most worthy members of the community ; but they form their judgment from the narrow circle of their own experience, and will not condescend for any consideration to look beyond that narrow circle. What they maintain is absolutely the reverse of the truth, for nothing is more certain than the taste of English people at one time for French wine. In earlier periods of our history French wine was the great article of consumption here. Taste is not an immutable, but a mutable thing. If you go back to what an eminent living poet has called

“ The spacious times of Great Elizabeth,”

you will find that the most delicate lady in the land did not scruple then to breakfast off beefsteaks and ale. Down to the revolution French wine was very largely consumed here. I have seen it stated, and have no reason to doubt the assertion, that in 1687 there were imported into this country 3,800,000 gallons

of French wine, or nearly two-thirds of the whole quantity of foreign wine which we now consume. How was this consumption subsequently checked and discouraged? By the influence of prohibitive duties. The prohibitive system grew up by degrees, and by degrees the English people were positively punished and starved out of their taste for French wine. But for 100 years, after that the taste itself remained, for when Mr. Pitt made the treaty of 1786, what was the result? According to the interesting paper written by Lord Chelsea, in the year preceding 1786 the import of French wine into England was under 100,000 gallons. In the six years from 1787 to 1792 the import grew to 683,000 gallons. Then, with the outbreak of the war, or not more than two or three years afterwards, a nearly prohibitive, at all events a high differential, duty was imposed, and the average import fell to 161,000 gallons. At that average it remained till 1824, when the differential duty, instead of 4s. 5d. became 2s. 5d. and the consumption rose to 379,000 gallons. I must admit that when the duties were finally equalized in 1830, the consumption of French wine did not increase. It seemed as if by that time, after the pressure of heavy duties for a century and a half, the taste for it was forgotten. It had become the luxury of a very limited class in the community, and of a class the variations of whose tastes are but little controlled by price. But it is remarkable that in conjunction with the very changes of taste which have been proceeding of late years, we may likewise perceive, even under the operation of the present wine duties, and without any fiscal change in their favour, proofs of a growing taste for French wine; for whereas from 1825 to 1830 we only consumed 379,000 gallons a year, and after 1830 that consumption was reduced to something like 310,000 or 315,000 gallons, on the average of the last ten years we have consumed 584,000 gallons; so that both the importation of French wines is absolutely increasing, and the percentage of the total consumption is relatively increasing. Taste, I say, is mutable. It is idle to talk of the taste for port and sherry and the highly brandied wines as fixed and unchangeable. There is a power of unbounded supply of wine if you will only alter your law, and there is a power I won't say of unbounded demand, but of an enormously increased demand, for this most useful and valuable commodity.

And now, Sir, I think cause enough has been already shown for an alteration in the present system of wine duties. But I beseech the Committee to remember the immense masses of evil

which are connected with that system. Look at the fraud and adulteration to which it gives rise. Many of the houses engaged in the wine trade bear as high a character as any in England ; but those gentlemen will tell you of the difficulties they have to encounter in holding their ground against persons of inferior character who are brought into that trade. And why do persons of inferior character embark in it ? Because our law invites them to do so. Because the restrictive operation of your tariff is so severe that it affords temptations which they cannot resist to counterfeit the article on which you have laid such heavy duties. That is the way in which the wine duties work ; and let me, in concluding my remarks on this subject, ask the Committee to consider yet one thing more. We hear of the rich man's luxuries, and of contemplated reductions of duty upon articles which the poor man does not consume. Now, I make my appeal to the friends of the poor man. There is a time which comes to all of us—the time, I mean, of sickness—when wine becomes a common necessary. What kind of wine is administered to the poor man in this country ? We have got a law which makes it impossible for the poor man when he is sick to obtain the comfort and support derived from good wine, unless he is fortunate enough to live in the immediate neighbourhood of some rich and charitable friend. Consult the medical profession ; ask what sort of wine is supplied to boards of guardians in this country ; go on board the Queen's ships, and see the wine supplied there. Some time ago I had the honour of being on board Her Majesty's ship *Scourge*, at a time when an accident had happened to one of the sailors. I went to see the man when he was recovering from the effects of an operation. "What wine do you give him ?" I asked. "We give him the wine of our mess," the surgeon told me ; "we cannot give him the wine supplied to the ship." He moreover insisted on my drinking some of the ship wine, and certainly it was with great difficulty I succeeded in accomplishing the operation. Now, this wine had without doubt been taken out of bond, and had paid no duty ; but our system of duty vitiates the entire trade, and, except with regard to the higher and most expensive class of wines, makes it almost impossible to obtain a sound or wholesome article. Certainly, Sir, I cannot think that, under those circumstances, the Government can require further justification for making proposals which will lead to an effectual diminution of these duties.

I believe I have now gone through the principal heads of the

Commercial Treaty with France. I do not think that the friends of free trade, or those who are anxious respecting the revenue, will find fault with the provisions of that treaty. I believe myself that you never were called upon to make a sacrifice—that is, an immediate sacrifice—of revenue which promised to be more fruitful of good. I believe that the trade which will be created will be immense; and I know very well that the expedition imparted to trade, and the economy brought about in the public establishments by abolishing the duties on manufactured goods, will form results of no common value. Again, everybody appreciates facility of personal intercourse with the Continent, and the changes we propose in our tariff will immensely facilitate that intercourse, by enabling the Customs authorities to withdraw the greater part of the annoying restraints which are now found necessary.

Sir, I cannot pass from the subject of the French treaty without paying a tribute of respect to two persons at least who have been the main authors of it. I am bound to bear this witness at any rate with regard to the Emperor of the French—that he has given the most unequivocal proofs of sincerity and earnestness in the progress of this great work, a work which he has prosecuted with clear-sighted resolution, not doubtless for British purposes, but in the spirit of enlightened patriotism, with a view to commercial reforms at home, and to the advantage and happiness of his own people. With regard to Mr. Cobden, speaking as I do at a time when every angry passion has passed away, I cannot help expressing our obligations to him for the labour he has, at no small personal sacrifice, bestowed upon a measure which he, not the least among the apostles of free trade, believes to be one of the greatest triumphs free trade has ever achieved. Rare is the privilege of any man who, having fourteen years ago rendered to his country one signal and splendid service, now again, within the same brief span of life, decorated neither by rank nor title, bearing no mark to distinguish him from the people whom he serves, has been permitted again to perform a great and memorable service to his Sovereign and to his country.

The point to which I have now brought the Committee in this, to them, I fear, laborious and irksome inquiry is this:—I have asked them to sacrifice £1,190,000 of the existing revenue in order to effect a relief to the consumer of, I think, £1,737,000, by giving effect to the provisions of the treaty with France. That treaty would bring about a sensible reform in the Customs

establishments of the country. At the same time, it would not effect a reform which would have any pretensions to the character of completeness, and there are many other duties still remaining on the tariff of a description which we think calls for the attention of Parliament, and by the reduction or removal of which immense advantage might be conferred upon the country. I have thought it best to separate them entirely from those articles which we deal with by the treaty, with a view to the convenience of the Committee and their clearer understanding of the whole subject. But this being the state of the case, and the Government wishing to give, as far as may be, the character of completeness to their reform of the Customs—which, indeed, is essential to the attainment of some of the objects in view—I now come to what I may term the supplemental measure of Customs reform.

It is our intention, Sir, to propose to the Committee a further change in the Customs laws, which will entail at first a loss of £910,000, giving at the same time a relief to the consumer of about £1,040,000 ; but we propose also, in a manner which I will explain to the Committee, to meet the charge of that loss by certain impositions upon trade of a character which I hope will not be deemed exceptionable. I will take these two subjects next. They together form the supplemental part of the Customs reform proposed by the Government.

This second portion of the Customs reform contains many abolitions and some reductions of the duty. I will read the principal abolitions contemplated. But, Sir, at this point my memory reminds me of an omission of which I have been guilty with reference to an important point in the treaty with France—I mean the proposal to give immediate effect to the changes on the English side, notwithstanding the postponement of the changes intended by France. The provision which we have adopted to this effect was not pressed upon us by France ; on the contrary, we have reason to believe that she would have given us the time which she was compelled to require for herself, but the arrangement I have stated to the Committee for early change in preference to general postponement was owing to the deliberate judgment of the English Government that it would be, on the whole, more advantageous to the English people.

Apologizing to the Committee for this omission, I now come to the abolition of duties which forms part of the second or supplementary part of the measure we propose for the alteration of the Customs law. We propose to abolish entirely and immediately

the duty on butter, which yields £95,000 ; the duty on tallow, which yields £87,000 ; the duty on cheese, which yields £44,000 ; on oranges and lemons, yielding £32,000 ; on eggs, £22,000 ; on nuts, £12,000 ; on nutmegs, £11,000 ; paper, £10,000 ; liquorice, £9,000 ; dates, £7,000 ; and various other minor articles, the total of these abolitions amounting to £382,000.

We propose likewise a reduction of duties upon five articles of great importance, one of which strikes at the principal differential duty, except those which we shall, I hope, abolish by the French treaty—namely, the duty on timber. I propose to reduce the duty on timber from 7s. 6d. and 15s. to the colonial rate of 1s. and 2s. There will be on this article a relief of £400,000 to the consumer, but we reckon on a considerable recovery by increased consumption. The next article, the duty on which I propose to reduce, with the approval of the House, is the duty on currants. There is no article of greater importance to the mass of the community. All those of the labouring classes who are in good circumstances are large consumers of currants. The duty now charged on currants ought to have been reduced many years ago—I mean in 1853 ; but it was impossible to recommend the change to Parliament at that period in consequence of the almost entire failure of the crop, which made it impracticable to act upon consumption by any reduction of the duty which we might have made. The duty on currants is now 15s. 9d. ; we propose to reduce it to 7s. per cwt. ; which will involve a loss of £170,000. This, however, will in part be compensated by increased consumption. We propose to reduce the duty on raisins from 10s. to 7s., on figs from 10s. to 7s. I also propose to reduce a duty with regard to which I shall have to give a further explanation—the duty on hops. I propose to reduce the duty on hops, not immediately, however, but on and after the 1st of January, from 45s. to 14s. The total amount of these reductions will be £650,000 and the abolitions of £382,000. There will also be a small article, namely, plaiting, the reduction on which will be postponed, and which will raise the gross loss to £1,035,000, but the increase of consumption will probably reduce this loss, as estimated, to £910,000.

I will presently state the general condition in which these changes, if they are adopted entire, will leave the tariff ; but for the present, I will go on to state the mode in which the Government propose to supply the revenue to compensate for the loss that will follow these last-named changes. I am afraid, from the

sensation that is expressed, that I may cause some disappointment, for, in point of fact, I am not now going to fill up the great chasm that lay before us a short time ago, but only to deal with the little chasm created by parting with the sum of £910,000. The general principle of the measures I am about to propose will be an extension of a minute kind of taxation which may be called generally penny taxation. The penny taxation has answered the purpose of assisting the revenue, but has not been unacceptable to the public. It seems to have shown that at least there is one kind of "penny wisdom" that is not "pound folly," for it has been at once popular and productive. We propose to levy upon all goods imported and exported, by way of registration due, a duty which will in general be charged at the rate of one penny per package. It has often been said and argued that when the tariff was cleared of so many articles, a small duty ought to have been retained to cover the cost of registration for statistics, and of the various services performed on behalf of trade by the Customs establishment. That is an argument of very considerable force, but there has been one argument, as I think, of conclusive weight the other way, which has determined successive Governments and Parliaments not to retain these duties on the tariff, and that is, that if you retain small duties on your tariff, they are attended with nearly all the incidents of a large duty. They require the same sort of inspection, the same following the goods, the same delay, and the same system of accounts, as if you were levying large and productive duties. But none of these objections apply to the measure I now propose. It would be a measure of the simplest kind, levied at the rate of 1*d.* per package, and, on goods in bulk, according to the unit under which they are entered. There must be a few cases of raw materials, such as salt, coals, and corn, as well as of packages of small value, in which it will be necessary to alter the unit to prevent the penny from becoming a heavy charge; either with reference to smallness of value, or because, not being entered in small parcels, but by the whole cargo, and not being warehoused, they give very little trouble to the Customs. All this, however, will be matter of consideration in the Bill, and it will be for the Executive Government, in the administration of the law, to place the matter under well-considered general rules. But what an idea it gives of the wealth and power of this country, that to levy a small duty of 1*d.* per package, and a similar rate on all goods in bulk, will produce £300,000 a year. This will be levied without any reference to

the goods whatever, and without any detention or examination. It will be taken off the ship's papers as one of the charges incidental to the receipt or despatch of the ship.

The next charge I propose to the Committee to enact is the charge upon certain operations now performed in warehouse. The Committee are aware that the original object of the warehousing system was to enable the importers of goods to obtain two most important advantages—one the postponement of the payment of the duties, and the other to retain for themselves the option to the latest moment between entering the goods for home consumption and entering them for a foreign market. With neither of these do we propose to interfere or to saddle them with any charge whatever. But it has here a consequence of one system of heavy and restrictive duties, particularly with regard to certain articles, such as spirits, and most of all wine, that we should endeavour to mitigate their pressure by a system of expedients. Hence there has grown up a most complicated system of operations of every kind, which are performed in bond at a great disadvantage in respect to delay, in respect to charge upon the Customs establishment by consuming the time of its officers, to the risk of fraud affecting injuriously the owners of the goods, and to the loss of revenue, which is a loss to the country. But great as are these evils, they are some of the necessary results of the state of our law. That state is now reverting to a more moderate range of duties and to a more simple arrangement. It is, therefore, clear that all these extraordinary operations which lie beyond the proper scope of the warehousing system, and were of the nature of additional accommodation, should be subject to some charge. We accordingly propose to fix moderate sums chargeable on all removals, on bottling, on vatting, "fortifying"—I might weary the Committee with the vocabulary of the system—in a word on all those extra operations which have grown up as excrescences on the warehousing system properly so called. The Committee will, I think, be glad to hear that we hope to find in this method of charge a mode of solving a very difficult question, which has excited a great deal of interest in many important communities. It is known as the question of inland bonding. The great inland towns of this country have always complained that they are excluded from the facilities given sometimes to what are little more than mere hamlets, and in many cases to places of no importance as measured by trade or population, if they chance to be ports, and this with respect to articles

which they do not themselves import. But under the system we propose certain charges will attach to removals in warehouse, whether they are on the coast or in the interior, which will place them all on an equal footing. Of course, I do not mean to say that even with this safeguard which we now propose, the warehousing system can be applied to every town in the country. The Government will have to consider carefully the sufficiency of the accommodation which may be offered, the amount of trade and population, and the probable results to the revenue; but the principle of the plan will be first to return to the country in part the cost of the warehousing establishment, and secondly to enable them to deal with equity and justice towards the little ports that enjoy these privileges because they happen to be ports within the meaning of the term, and at the same time to enable great communities like Manchester, Birmingham, and other large towns, which are fairly entitled to demand a concession of this kind, to obtain corresponding advantages. By this plan I expect to gain £120,000.

The next change I am about to propose is one upon which it will be desirable that the Committee should give a vote to-night, in conformity with its ordinary practice. I propose to levy a duty of 6s. per cwt. upon chicory or any other vegetable production to be used with coffee, as a protection to the coffee revenue, which has not grown, and which cannot grow as long as an article that assumes the appearance of coffee is admitted free, while coffee itself pays a high duty. It will be requisite that the Customs shall be in a condition to give immediate effect to this Resolution, and I therefore at once hand the Resolution to you, Mr. Massey, as I proceed. I may mention that this enactment will entail the disadvantage of an Excise charge upon home-grown chicory, but that is not a serious matter, because the growth of chicory in this country has almost died out. Some years ago many thousand acres were employed in the growth of chicory, but at the present day the whole quantity under cultivation so far as I can learn, is under 500 acres. The duty on chicory, together with the improvement of the revenue from coffee, may be expected to yield £90,000 per annum, a sum which will bring up these minor Customs charges to £510,000.

I will now briefly run over the changes which, with a similar view, we would ask the Committee to adopt in the department of Inland Revenue. A stamp of 1*d.* on notes of sale of foreign and colonial produce and on brokers' contract notes will yield

£100,000. A stamp of 3*d.* on dock warrants is computed to yield £100,000 ; a reduction of the agreement stamp from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 6*d.* with the repeal of the exemption, under £20, will yield £20,000. The next change which we propose is to give to eating-houses of all descriptions, whether under that name or under the name of pastry-cooks' shops, a licence, for which they will pay at a very low rate, together with the power of taking a licence at their option from the Excise, to be had simply on the payment of a certain sum of money, and subject to no other limitation or restriction except rules of police, for the purpose of authorizing them to sell wine or beer. We think it is essential, in giving effect to the changes in the wine duties, that this sort of facility should be provided in connexion with the sale of eatables, wherever the trade may be carried on ; and we also look on it as a change favourable to sobriety ; for the man who can get his glass of wine or beer at the same time with his necessary food in an easy manner is less likely to resort to places whither he would repair for drinking only, and where he would be tempted to indulge to excess. We also propose that by way of restraint, the duty should be doubled upon any such house that keeps open after 12 o'clock at night. Then there are a variety of very limited minor changes with which I am also ashamed to trouble the Committee. One change, however, I will mention. We propose to reduce the duty on game certificates, an alteration which I trust will be satisfactory. Only 34,000 game certificates are taken out every year, The price is very high, and no person can shoot for a day at any period of the season without paying the price of a certificate for the whole season. But the immediate and obvious ground for dealing with this licence, is the notorious fact that vast numbers of persons of almost all classes who do shoot at all, assume to themselves the liberty of shooting without a certificate. We are not able to detect more than some 400 or 500 of them in the course of the year ; but I hope that so many will not escape, indeed, that so many will not offend, under the new system. We anticipate that while we shall give relief by this change to those who buy certificates to the amount of £50,000, we shall have no loss, but even a small gain of something like £10,000 a year. Instead of £4 for a certificate for the season, it will be had, if taken out in August, for £3 ; if taken out on or after the 1st of October, £2 ; and if taken out on or after the 1st of December, £1.

As respects the measure of the right hon. gentleman opposite, which was adopted with regard to stamps on cheques, we have

not yet had sufficient experience to test its full effects, either fiscally or otherwise ; but I think it is quite clear that if it continues, as it is likely to do, at least till we see our way more clearly, there should be no exemption for cheques when the drawer is also the payee. It is not worth while keeping up the distinction, and a small sum will be gained by its abolition. We therefore propose to remove it. The stamp on leases will yield £7,000. All personal estate, passing by will, under general appointment, will become subject to probate duty, which will yield £30,000 ; and the repeal of the exemption of the conveyances of building societies will give £5,000. The Excise duty on chicory will yield £5,000, and a stamp on extracts from the registers of births, deaths, and marriages £3,000. Lastly, by bringing heritable bonds in Scotland under all the liabilities of personalty on a succession, we shall gain £10,000. I may now sum up. The new cheques under the Customs will give £510,000, which, added to £386,000, the produce of the items of Inland Revenue I have referred to, will give a total of £896,000. The next item on this side of the account will give pleasure to the Committee. It is not a tax, but a saving ; and a saving which of all others will, I am sure, be most acceptable to Parliament and to the people. It is a saving for the year on the Customs Establishment of £50,000, which will be the beginning of a greater saving in consequence of the measures we are going to adopt. There will also be a saving in the department of Inland Revenue, if the measures we propose should be agreed to, of £36,000. There will, therefore, be altogether £86,000 in saving, and £896,000 in taxes, making together £982,000, which will more than replace the revenue we propose to withdraw in the second part of our scheme of commercial amendment.

Let me now once more recall to the Committee the precise point at which we stand. We venture to urge that the country may fairly expect, under the circumstances of the present year, a reduction of the indirect taxes, chosen with the greatest care for the purpose, to an extent something like that which is represented by the amount of difference between the present war duties, so to call them, on tea and sugar, and likewise by the amount of annuities now falling in. The annuities on £2,146,000, and the difference on tea and sugar duties would be represented by nearly the same sum. I mean the country has a right to expect we should proceed to that extent in loss to the revenue, but to a much greater extent in relief to consumers. Of that £2,146,000

we have disposed of about £1,190,000 by the Treaty with France, so far as the plans of the Government are concerned ; and by way of supplement to that treaty, we have also proposed a further measure involving the loss of £910,000, with compensation in the shape of new charges and savings to the extent of £982,000. Consequently, there is still about £1,000,000 of remission, which, in the view of the Government, is due to the trade and industry of the country on the principles I have stated. The question remains, where shall that reduction be made ?

As we have frankly admitted, we do not think the greatest benefit would be conferred either on the nation at large, or on the labouring classes, by an immediate return to the *minimum* duty on sugar and tea ; and though we might take either of the two, we could not, consistently with what I have thus far proposed, take both. As we do not think that is the direction in which relief may be best conferred, I think the Committee will readily guess what I am about to propose—the abolition of the Excise duty on paper. There is only one argument I know against its abolition, and that is, that the revenue derived from it is a growing revenue. The reason why it is so is, that we live in a country with a growing literature and a growing trade ; and, as neither literature nor trade can be carried on without paper, it follows that as long as the country grows in literature and trade the paper duty must increase, however impolitic, however burdensome it may be in its operation. But let the Committee briefly consider with me some of the reasons for the repeal of the paper duty. First of all, I do not hesitate to say that one reason for this repeal, not, perhaps, conclusive in itself, but certainly far from immaterial in the view of any British Ministry, is that the duty has been condemned by the House of Parliament. And how has it been condemned ? Not by any chance majority, not by an Opposition happening to overpower a resisting Government, but with the full concurrence of the responsible executive of the day. On the 21st of June, 1858, my right hon. friend, now President of the Board of Trade,<sup>1</sup> made this Motion :—

“ That it is the opinion of this House that the maintenance of the Excise duty on paper, as a permanent source of revenue, will be impolitic.”

The Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>2</sup> objected to a second Resolution which was proposed by my hon. friend for the purpose of driving the nail a little further home ; and, on the second Resolution

<sup>1</sup> Mr. T. Milner Gibson.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

being withdrawn, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. gentleman opposite,<sup>1</sup> adopted the first Resolution, said that the duty required not immediate, but yet early consideration ; and the Resolution was thereupon adopted unanimously by the House. It is a question whether it is altogether a wise practice to adopt Resolutions that condemn duties which cannot at the time be repealed, and I am afraid subsequent inconveniences are apt to grow out of such a practice ; but the fact that the House of Commons has recorded that judgment is a material element in the case we are now considering.

That, however, is not all. The paper duty is in many respects a bad duty, and I will show presently that it is also becoming untenable in law. In the first place, as an uniform duty on a very variable article, how does it operate ? It presses on the poorer sorts, and while we find that the duty on fine papers, owing to the growth of literature, is rapidly increasing, on the coarse sorts it does not advance. Look again at its operation on literature. On dear books, which are published for the wealthy, it is a very light duty ; on books brought out in large quantities by enterprising publishers for the middle and lower classes it is a very heavy and a very oppressive duty. I think the Committee will admit that it is a most desirable and legitimate object to promote the extension of cheap literature. I do not speak of newspapers alone, but of newspapers and periodical publications in common with all other cheap literature which we have seen so greatly enlarged of late, and the character of which I am bound to say since the penny stamp on newspapers was removed has been so highly creditable to the conductors of what is called the cheap press. It is hardly possible to describe, except by details on which I shall not venture, the manner in which the paper duty obstructs general skill and enterprise. But the subject has this characteristic, which I beg to call to the special attention of the Committee. The material with which it deals is a material of almost boundless scope, for nearly everything which is fibrous may in one manner or another be made to serve the purpose of paper. I spoke just now of the production of British and spurious wines. I am told that in an inland town there is a manufacture of British champagne. It is made from rhubarb, and the suggestion has been made that after all the champagne has been extracted from the rhubarb the fibre should be made into paper. That is a very good recommendation. I believe, really and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

seriously, that whatever is grown with fibre would, by skill and enterprise, probably be made available in one mode or another for the purposes of paper if it were not for the necessary obstructions offered by the regulations of the Excise Department. But again, what are the purposes of paper? Not only those narrow ones with which the ordinary experience of every man makes him familiar. I do not think the Committee is aware of the enormous variety of purposes to which the use of this material may, in one form or another, be applied. I have a list of sixty-nine trades, in not one of which an ordinary consumer would guess it to be used. For example, it is largely used by anatomical machinists to make artificial limbs, by telescope makers, by boot and shoe makers, by cap manufacturers for the foundations of caps and hats, forming all the peaks and many of the tops which look like leather, by china and porcelain manufacturers, by coach makers, by comb makers, by doll makers (most dolls being made of a material into the composition of which paper enters), by shipbuilders, in making optical instruments, in pictures and looking-glasses, in portmanteaux, in Sheffield goods, and in tea-pots. One manufacturer writes that he has made panels for doors from paper, and looks forward, above all, to making carriages of paper when the duty is taken off. Another manufacturer, who is asked into what combinations paper may be made to enter, says—and I think it is a very just and forcible observation:—“Who can fix the limit to ingenious combinations when we see india-rubber, for instance, being made into strong and durable combs and other articles of that sort? Only this morning,” he proceeds, “he was informed that paper pipes are made, prepared with bitumen, and capable of standing a pressure of 300 lb. of water to the inch.” These are partial but not uninteresting details, and I think that to which they bear witness is the unbounded expansion of which this trade is capable, and the way in which we may confer benefit on the working-classes by means of abolishing this duty—not only because they will get cheaper paper, which must be of advantage to every man who furnishes a cottage and desires to give some of his rooms an appearance of comfort and neatness, and to every purchaser of tea and sugar, into the cost of which it enters when tea and sugar are wrapped in it; but by putting in motion an immense trade it will give a greater and wider stimulus to the demand for the labour of the country. Above all other benefits, let me say the great advantage of this change, in my opinion, and in the opinion of Her Majesty’s

Government, is, that we may promote a diffused demand and a demand for rural labour ; that we shall not merely stimulate the process of massing people in great centres of industry, but the demand for labour all over the country. Where there are streams, where there are villages, where there is pure and good air and tolerable access, there are the places where the paper manufacture tends to establish itself. And there is a gentleman, a member of this House, second to no man in England for enterprise, who did within the last few years illustrate the effect of the paper manufacture on the poor rate. The paper duty has indeed, I fear, materially helped to extinguish all the small paper manufacturers. It has concentrated the trade in a few great hands. Village mills are hardly to be found. I want to see, and I do not despair of seeing, these village mills spring up again and flourish. The case I quote, to show the effect of paper manufacture upon the poor rate, is that of a Member of this House, who a few years ago, with a view to the supply of paper for a well-known periodical, established a paper manufactory at Rickmansworth, and within three or four years the poor-rates of Rickmansworth were diminished by one-half. In this condition, I believe they continued so long as that paper mill was at work. This is an argument of a nature to be readily appreciated and understood. And, Sir, before I conclude the subject, I must state yet one other point. I told the Committee that this duty was rapidly becoming untenable, and I am bound to warn them, as I have done with respect to the wine duties, that such is the state of things to which it tends. It is not only invidious to maintain it when every other duty of the same class has been abolished, but the law is rapidly becoming incapable of being administered without discredit. The heads of the Inland Revenue Department are completely agreed that there ought to be a repeal of the duty. I asked the gentlemen whom I may call the agitators against the duty to furnish their reasons in a series of short propositions, in order to see how far they could be admitted by the Inland Revenue. They sent me fifteen arguments, and I transmitted them to the Board of Inland Revenue. The heads of that department said, that two of the propositions were rather in the nature of general propositions of political economy upon which they would give no opinion, but that with regard to all the other thirteen they agreed with the agitators. You cannot reckon on being able to maintain the duty beyond a certain time, because such are the difficulties raised as to what is paper and what is not paper, as

to what are sheets of fibrous substance and what are not, that not only is there the greatest soreness among the manufacturers, and the sense of injustice that attends capricious and unequal law, but the officers of revenue find it more and more difficult to perform their duty ; and the maintainers of the law will soon be placed in the ridiculous position in which they were placed when they were some years ago unable to say what was a newspaper. In short, as the paper duty must sooner or later follow the newspaper stamp, we say let it be sooner and not later, and we propose that it should follow now. It is proposed that the paper duty shall be abolished after the 1st of July next, and that drawback shall be allowed on stocks in the hands of the dealers subject to the usual rules. There will be a loss by the repeal of the paper duty in 1860-1861 of £1,000,000. But the repeal of the paper duty will enable us to take some other measures which are very desirable ; to clear the tariff of all the articles coming under the heads of furnishing paper, writing paper, books, prints, and engravings, and it will greatly simplify the laborious and difficult task which the Custom-house officers have to perform in searching the luggage of passengers for pirated books—an office by which they at present afford to possessors of a particular kind of property a protection which is afforded to no other kind of property, and which ought not to be afforded to them at the cost of the revenue. Of course, whenever the Custom-house officers observe an illegal commodity it will be their duty to stop it, but an officious and vexatious description of search will, as I am informed, no longer be necessary.

The abolition of the paper duty will moreover save £20,000 a year in the establishment of the Board of Inland Revenue ; and it will likewise enable us to adopt another measure of some importance which I will in a very few words describe ; I refer to the abolition of the impressed stamp on newspapers. The impressed stamp on newspapers is attended with difficulties which, if I were dealing with that subject alone, I might spend a long time in explaining. It recognizes the exceptional status of newspapers, and again raises the question, “ What is a newspaper ? ” The Post Office authorities find it impossible to draw a distinction between publications entitled to the impressed stamp and other periodicals. It involves a great deal of unrequited service ; and nothing is more absurd than that when the Post Office carries newspapers, or any other printed matter not exceeding four ounces in weight for a penny, they should be liable, after a stamp

is impressed, to carry it half-a-dozen times over for the same money. Again, it requires a distinct code for itself. There are some fifteen or twenty special regulations which every one is bound to observe, but which nobody does observe, to secure the condition upon which the privilege is given ; and this privilege, as to the mode of stamping newspapers, and as to postage, is a privilege most inconvenient to the parties and to the revenue. The State is obliged, on the one hand, to keep up various establishments for no other purpose than stamping the paper for newspapers, and newspaper proprietors are, on the other hand, with a few exceptions, obliged to cart all their paper to the establishment where this department of revenue is raised, in order to get it stamped. I cannot but think that that is a system fraught with great inconvenience and loss ; it is inconvenient to the proprietors of newspapers, while it involves a loss of public money, and, therefore, it furnishes a strong argument for the abolition of the stamp. We propose, therefore, that the stamp should be abolished on the day on which the alteration in the stamp laws takes place.

But there are certain papers that take advantage of certain occasions, and among them that great paper *The Times*, of a three-halfpenny stamp. It would be a hardship to those papers if we called upon them to pay a two-penny postage, where they now pay only three-halfpence, and this difficulty we propose to surmount by the simple method of introducing a three-halfpenny rate into the present scale of the book postage, which will accordingly stand as follows : up to four ounces, 1*d.* ; six ounces, 1½*d.* ; eight ounces, 2*d.* ; and so on. This is a change which I think will at once recommend itself to the general favour of the Committee.

I have now stated all the remissions and changes of duty which the Government propose to recommend to the House ; but with a view to the necessary balance of the revenue it is necessary that I should still refer to some articles which are connected with the departments of Excise and taxes. I have mentioned the article of hops ; and I have now to state that we propose to alter the system of hop credits. That system is one that is indefensible in principle, and has nothing to recommend it in point of convenience. As things now are, the grower of hops who picks and gathers in his hops in August or September and sells them in October is not called on to pay the duty till the following May, when he pays one half and the other half in November, when he

has actually got in hand another crop. This is a system that is highly disadvantageous to the revenue, while no good reason recommends it on the part of the producer ; we, therefore, propose as a substitute that the hop-grower, who as a general rule has parted with his crops in October or November, shall, for the next and all coming crops, pay the duty on the following 1st of January. As, however, by taking away the hop credits we to some extent put a pressure on the grower, and as we are going to admit the foreign hop-grower to equal competition with him, we propose to give a partial remission of the duty, which will stand no longer at 19s. 7d., but at 14s. per cwt. or 1½d. per pound. I also have to mention a change in respect of malt. Malt is at present prohibited. We propose to remit the prohibition, and substitute a Customs duty of 3s. per bushel, being 2s. 9d. and 5 per cent. with a further allowance in consideration of the indirect burdens imposed by the Excise on the maltster over and above the duty in reference to the Excise. The subject of compensation reminds me that it is important to consider what will be the relation of the change in the wine duties to the duty on malt. I shall be prepared to show that when the change in the wine duties has taken effect, wine of the only description that can compete with malt will pay a tax a great deal heavier than malt, and malt, therefore, will not be subject to any undue pressure.

Let me now, Sir, bring into one view the alterations which I have stated in detail. In doing so I must endeavour to bring clearly before the mind of the Committee three separate sums—1st, the entire amount of the remission or relief to the consumers by the adoption of the plans we propose ; 2nd, the amount of loss to the revenue which they will entail ; 3rd, the amount of compensation which will be derived from the new charges upon operations of trade which we recommend for the adoption of the Committee. The Customs duties altered under the treaty with France will give relief to the consumers of a sum of £1,737,000, and will cause a loss to the revenue of £1,190,000. By the supplemental Customs plan we will give relief to the consumers of £1,039,000, and there will be a loss to the revenue of £910,000 ; total relief to the consumers, £2,771,000 ; total loss to the revenue, £2,100,000. In the Inland Revenue Department there will be a relief on paper of £1,000,000 ; on hops, £105,000 ; and on game certificates, £50,000 ; making in all, £1,155,000 ; and a total loss to the revenue for the present year of £990,000. There will thus be a total relief to the consumers in the Customs and Inland

Revenue Departments of £3,931,000, and a loss to the revenue of £3,090,000. The amount of compensation by means of increased consumption has here been estimated at £841,000, but there will be a further compensation by new charges and by savings on establishments of £982,000, being a total of £1,823,000. Taking this computation, and deducting £1,823,000 from £3,931,000, there will be a net loss to the revenue for 1860-61 of £2,108,000, a sum which, as the Committee will observe, very nearly indeed corresponds with the amount of relief which we are about to receive by the falling in of the Long Annuities.

There will, it is true, be a further loss, in consequence of the projected changes, of something more than £700,000. But I have no scruple in casting this burden on the year 1861-2, inasmuch as I feel that the effect of the changes we propose upon trade and consumption will be to enlarge its revenue in more than a corresponding degree.

I will not state in a few words the effect of these changes in bringing forward that most desired consummation of all Reformers—a simplification of the Customs tariff of the country. The number of articles subject to Customs duties on the 1st of January, 1842, was 1,052; in 1845 it amounted to 1,163 articles; for I must remind the House that the first operation of the reform of the tariff was to multiply the number of articles, in consequence of the transition from duties *ad valorem* to rated or specific duties, which caused an increase of the headings under which they were described. In 1853 the number of articles was 466; lastly, on the 1st of January, 1859, 419. After the changes now proposed are adopted, without allowing for a few subdivisions, such as the specification of two or three classes of sugar, the whole number of articles remaining on the tariff will be forty-eight. We shall have three classes of articles, including in all fifteen, which are in reality the only articles that will be retained on the tariff for purposes of revenue. They are as follows: First, five articles yielding from one to six millions: spirits, sugar, tea, tobacco, and wine. Secondly, four articles yielding from £200,000 to £1,000,000: coffee, corn, currants, and timber. Thirdly, six articles yielding from £20,000 to £200,000: chicory, figs and fig-cake, hops, pepper, raisins, and rice. Besides those fifteen articles there are twenty-nine which, though yielding revenue, are only retained on special grounds. Thus five articles are to be retained on account of countervailing duties of Excise on domestic articles, and twenty-four on account of their resemblance to one

or other of the fifteen articles I have adverted to. We could not, for example, admit eau de Cologne free of duty while there is a duty on brandy. It thus follows that your Customs revenue will be derived substantially from fifteen articles. That is a result which I hope Custom-house reformers will be of opinion justifies the changes we have made.

There will then be a relief from indirect taxation of about £4,000,000. Out of that £1,000,000 paper duty will go directly to stimulate the demand for diffused and rural labour, £1,800,000, or the greater part of £2,000,000, under the French treaty, and £400,000 more taken off the timber duties, will in every instance strike at differential duties, and will be the means of removing from the tariff its greatest, perhaps its only remaining deformities. There will be on the British tariff, after the adoption of these changes, nothing whatever in the nature of protective or differential duties, unless we apply that name to the small charges which will be levied upon timber and corn, and which amount in general, perhaps, to about 3 per cent. on the value. With that limited exception you will have a final disappearance of all protective and differential duties, so that the consumer will know that every shilling he pays will go to the revenue, and not to the domestic as against the foreign producer. You will have a great extension and increase of trade, you will have a remission of the principal restraints upon travellers, and a great reduction in the expenses of the Customs and Excise Departments. I mentioned that, as is indeed obvious, those reductions must be brought in by degrees and in detail. They will not appear upon the Estimates as they are presented for this year, because it is impossible to foresee especially, until we know what the decision of Parliament will be, the precise changes which will be made. The immediate reduction in the Customs Department will be £50,000, in the Excise £86,000; and the ultimate reduction upon the expenses of the Customs Department alone I expect will be somewhere about £150,000. That is the nature of the change we propose in the system of Customs and Excise.

It is now time that I should for the last time revert to the state of the general account. It would have been possible to come to it, perhaps, by a less circuitous route, and, as I stated before, a shilling income tax would have balanced the income and expenditure without any further trouble. But I come to consider what are the means by which we propose to bring about a balance. I do not indeed pretend to present to the House a Budget which

grapples with all the difficulties of the case that is before us. I do not, let me again press on the notice of the Committee, propose to provide for the Exchequer bonds ; a shilling income tax perhaps would have effected that purpose too. I have called the attention of the House to the fact that we are going to take away the six weeks' credit now allowed to maltsters, which will give us £1,100,000 within the financial year. The hop credit will give us £300,000 more. The two sums together amount to £1,400,000. They do not belong to the year, although on the other hand they are not borrowed money. They actually belong to the public, and they may be said at present to be public capital lent out to the producer of certain commodities without interest which we propose to call in and apply to the purposes of the year. But the deficit which I pointed out, and which it is incumbent on us to supply, amounted to £9,400,000. The aids which I have mentioned reduce it only to £8,000,000. After this statement, you will not, perhaps, consider that there remains to us much liberty of choice. I have pointed out that a one shilling income tax would completely fill the void, and would enable you to dispense with the remaining part of the war duties on tea and sugar. Without any remission of the duties on sugar or tea or paper, and without the slightest attempt to improve your fiscal laws and extend your trade, you cannot escape with an income tax less than the amount at which it now stands, 9*d.* in the pound. We have proposed to you a remission which goes to the extent of £4,000,000, and the additional taxation which we have so far presented, falls entirely upon trade ; and now I will state in what manner we propose to supply the deficiency which remains. The charge for 1860-61, as I have stated, is £70,100,000 ; the income with the tea and sugar duties at their *minimum* would have been £60,700,000. Deducting from that income the loss by remissions, the amount would be £58,592,000 ; but by retaining the tea and sugar duties at their present rates we shall have an addition of £2,100,000, bringing up the income to nearly the point where it before stood, or £60,692,000. But when we compare £60,692,000 with £70,100,000, there is still a deficiency of nearly £9,500,000. Against that deficiency, besides taking up the malt and hop credits, which will give £1,400,000, we propose to renew the income tax at a rate only higher by one penny than that which it would be necessary under any circumstances to propose—namely, at 10*d.* in the pound. The assessment will be 10*d.* in the pound on incomes above £150, and 7*d.* in the pound below that amount

No new returns will be called for under any of the schedules, and the tax will be taken for one year only. Both with regard to that subject and the duties on tea and sugar we wish to reserve to Parliament the fullest and freest discretion. Instead of the old system, under which only half the year was collected within the year, though by law three-quarters ought to be collected, we shall require three-quarters to be actually collected. The consequence of that will be, that the income tax at 10*d.* with three-quarters collected within the year, will give £8,472,000. There will still remain due, after April, 1861, one quarter of the income tax, about £2,250,000, nearly the same sum as now remains due by law after April, 1860. There is but one slight change in it which we propose; it regards the mode of assessing railways. This proposal, which will be convenient both for the companies and for the Government, will be to assess them at their head offices instead of in the various districts through which they run. I think the House will now understand how the final balance for the year will be adjusted. But I may repeat the particulars. The revenue, after the deductions and remissions, and without allowing for what may be called the war duties on tea and sugar, stands at £58,592,000. I put the tea and sugar duties renewed at the present rates yield £2,100,000, the malt and hop credits taken up give £1,400,000, the income tax for three-quarters of the year furnishes £8,472,000. That brings up the total income to £70,564,000. The total charge is £70,100,000, which leaves an apparent estimated surplus of £464,000.

As regards the method of proceeding to submit these measures, and in conformity with what I have already said, I will ask the House to pass the vote relating to chicory to-night, and the order in which we will take the other subjects will, without reference to any other matter which may intervene, be as follows. We shall proceed first with those portions of the Customs duties which are involved in the treaty with France, and among them we shall begin with the duties on wines. I cannot overstate to the Committee the importance both to trade and to the revenue of proceeding to deal with these subjects at the earliest possible day. We should not like to make an unreasonable demand on the House or on individual Members, and, as I now speak on Friday, we could not ask the House to take an earlier day than Thursday next; but I trust that the Committee and its members individually will allow of our proceeding on that day in a matter where despatch is of so great importance. We should, after

that, proceed with the supplementary resolutions, or the second part of our plan, relating to the Customs duties ; we should then take the Excise duties, and after that the duties on tea and sugar. Probably before we get so far we shall have made some progress in the Estimates, and it will be then convenient to take the income tax.

And now, Sir, without seeking to place on the propositions, I have made a colour more favourable than they may deserve, I have endeavoured to bring strongly and clearly into view the most prominent features of the plan of the Government. We propose an ample provision for the service of the year. Our plan gives a sanction to the employment of some subsidiary resources in aid of the ordinary revenue of the year, in consideration of the great demands made on the people ; it involves a high rate of income tax, and it abandons all endeavour to make a financial settlement for a term of years, a method which we do not think suited to the existing state of affairs. Those gentlemen who may entertain a hope of some material reduction in our expenditure at an early date will be disposed, I think, to agree in the wisdom and propriety of such a course. Our proposals involve a great reform in our tariff, they involve a large remission of taxation, and last of all, though not least, they include that Commercial Treaty with France which, though objections may be taken to it, we confidently recommend, not only on moral and social, and political, but also, and with equal confidence, on fiscal and economical grounds. In conclusion, I may presume to say that I feel a hope which amounts to a persuasion, that this House, whatever may happen, will not shrink from its duty. After all it has heretofore achieved by resolute and persevering commercial reforms on behalf of the masses of the people, and not on behalf of them alone, but on behalf of every class, on behalf of the Throne, and of the institutions of the country, I feel convinced that this House will not refuse to go boldly on in the direction in which Parliament has already reaped such honours and rewards. By pursuing such a course as this it will be in your power to scatter blessings among the people, and blessings which are among the soundest and most wholesome of all the blessings at your disposal, because in legislation of this kind you are not forging mechanical helps for men, nor endeavouring to do that for them which they ought to do for themselves ; but you are enlarging their means without narrowing their freedom, you are giving value to their labour, you are appealing to their sense of responsibility, and you are

not impairing their sense of honourable self-dependence. There were times, now long gone by, when Sovereigns made progress through the land, and when, at the proclamation of their heralds, they caused to be scattered heaps of coin among the people who thronged upon their steps. That may have been a goodly spectacle; but it is also a goodly spectacle, and one adapted to the altered spirit and circumstances of our times, when our Sovereign is enabled through the wisdom of her great Council assembled in Parliament around her, again to scatter blessings among her subjects by means of wise and prudent laws; of laws which do not sap in any respect the foundations of duty or of manhood, but which strike away the shackles from the arm of industry, which give new incentive and new reward to toil, and which win more and more for the Throne and for the institutions of the country the gratitude, the confidence, and the love of an united people. Let me say even to those who are anxious, and justly anxious, on the subject of our national defences, that that which stirs the flame of patriotism in men, that which binds them in one heart and soul, that which gives them increased confidence in their rulers, that which makes them feel and know that they are treated with justice, and that we who represent them are labouring incessantly and earnestly for their good—is in itself no small, no feeble, and no transitory part of national defence. We recommend these proposals to your impartial and searching inquiry; we do not presume indeed to make a claim on your acknowledgments, but neither do we desire to draw on your generous confidence, nor to lodge an appeal to your compassion. We ask for nothing more and nothing less than your dispassionate judgment; we know that our plan will receive that justice at your hands, and we confidently anticipate on its behalf the approval alike of the Parliament and the nation.

## TAXATION OF CHARITIES

MAY 4, 1863

Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Taxation of Charities is famous as an example of purely abstract reasoning addressed to the House of Commons. He had included in his Budget for 1863, a Budget not otherwise remarkable, a proposal for taxing the income of charitable institutions. This proposal naturally excited much resistance, and was eventually dropped. But Gladstone's speech was not really answered. His principal arguments were two. In the first place he urged that the State by conferring immunity from taxation upon a particular class of societies gave them an implied guarantee, whereas they might be unsound, or actually insolvent. In the second place he pointed out that real charity enjoyed no exemption at all. What a man gave in his lifetime, which came out of his own pocket, and proved his generosity, was taxed to the last farthing, for it was part of his income. Bequests to charities, which were exempted, were left at the expense of heirs, and involved no generosity on the part of the testator. These pleas availed nothing against the cry that taxing charities was robbing the poor, and Gladstone received no independent support from either side of the House. On the other hand, his argumentative challenge met with no reply. The speech has been compared, as a specimen of deductive reasoning and a logical masterpiece, with Sir Robert Walpole's attack upon the Peerage Bill, which would have limited, and reduced to a very narrow compass, the Royal Prerogative of making Peers. Walpole was successful, and the Bill was defeated. Gladstone's effort failed. But in both cases the weapon of logic was applied to a Parliamentary purpose, and in both it was handled with consummate dexterity. At the same time it is impossible to read Gladstone's speech without perceiving that he was animated by sincere conviction, and that he regarded the system which he sought to alter as unjust. It was characteristic of his mind that, when he had satisfied himself on which side justice lay, he at once began to construct an argumentative chain from premisses to conclusion, so that each link would bear the strain imposed upon it. In this particular instance he no doubt felt that popular sentiment was against him, and that he would have to rely upon reason only, without any assistance from sympathy or feeling. The case, however, admits of being presented in a very plain and practical way. If a rich man gave away every year nine-tenths of his income, he would not be entitled to any reduction of his income-tax. But if he left a million in charity, and made no provision for his family, the interest of that money would pay nothing to the State.

SIR, in proceeding to redeem the pledge I have given to the Committee, I shall address myself exclusively to the main question. It is one of quite sufficient difficulty, magnitude, and importance to justify a separate discussion. I shall alto-

gether decline to embarrass myself, and I think also the Committee, by entering upon peculiar cases, which may be urged upon peculiar grounds. The question which, on the part of the Government, I wish to raise is this:—Whether the law shall be modified which at the present moment extends to bequests for charitable uses an immunity, as I shall show, from all direct taxation whatever, while, at the same time, very heavy charges have been undertaken on behalf of those charities by the State. The question of dealing with these endowments I shall not perplex by asking myself whether one or two cases such as the Patriotic Fund, where we have to deal with temporary and expiring arrangements, ought to be included in the scope of this proposition or not. I shall not even discuss whether the provisions we have made for saving what is termed the “vested interests” of actual holders of the fruits of charities are sufficient or not. The discussions that have taken place, and the information that has reached me, lead me to believe that those provisions will require little modification. It is, however, my intention to propose in the fourth clause of the Bill to insert a certain qualification of that enactment which obliges trustees to draw from any other funds in their possession rather than to make a deduction or abatement in respect of the income tax from the recipients of small doles; it is my intention to propose to insert words to prevent that enactment from falling on the residue in cases where that residue has been either under deed or customarily disposed of in salaries, because there are certain classes of cases which require provisions of that kind. In the same manner an important question has been raised as to limited amounts which are held by way of reserve by funds dependent upon voluntary contributions—that is a question wholly distinct in principle from the very large, and as I think, very important question upon which I am about to invite the attention of the Committee.

Now, Sir, as to the proposal itself, it would be absurd in me to affect ignorance of the amount of opposition that has been excited in the country, and which, by a process that is perfectly legitimate, has found, and is likely to find, abundant expression in this House. The conviction of the Government is, that the proposal they make is a wise one—that they are offering a mild and temperate compromise, equitable, and even lenient in a high degree, as respects the mass of charitable property; and, moreover, that they are offering a compromise upon a matter which

is quite certain to grow to such urgency before any very great length of time as almost by compulsion to invite the attention of Parliament, probably for purposes, in many respects, much more stringent than any to which the assent of Parliament is now invited. Having that opinion, I at once, on the other hand, make the admission to the Committee that this is not a proposal which either can be or ought to be carried—if, indeed, it could be carried—unless with the free and deliberate sanction of this House. It is not a proposal in respect to which the influence of an Administration to any greater or lesser degree ought to be brought to bear. This, which is obvious to all in regard to this subject, is freely admitted by the Government; but they are under the belief that this is a new question, and that the facts which it contains, and the reasons which can be brought to bear upon it, ought to be brought into the light of day; and I have that confidence in the fairness and justice of the House which induces me fearlessly to appeal to them for a candid hearing of the statement which I am about to submit to them.

I have said, that this is a question upon which, up to the present time, no verdict of Parliament has been taken. I may be told, and I have been told here and elsewhere, that the authority of Mr. Pitt and of Sir Robert Peel can be quoted against me. I demur to that assertion. The income tax of Mr. Pitt was a personal income tax, and it was hardly possible, by its machinery, for him to have got at the revenues of corporations. The first endeavour, and the endeavour most consistent with the principle of an Income Tax Act, was an endeavour to obtain a return from individuals in respect of real property just as of personal property. It was by Lord Sidmouth, and not by Mr. Pitt, as I consider, that authority was first given for the exemption of charitable institutions from taxation. But I am bound to point out, that upon the point of charitable institutions little or nothing was known, except one thing indeed, and that is that their state was one shameful to their administration. That point has been placed upon record from no reforming or radical authority, for Lord Eldon, in a case before the Court of Chancery in 1807; says—

“It is necessary to be perfectly understood that the charity estates all over the kingdom are dealt with in a manner most grossly improvident and of a most direct breach of trust.”

And here I must advert to another point for a moment. It

is very difficult to assert a negative as to the voluminous records of Parliament, and therefore I should be slow to say that the matter never has been discussed; but the only discovery that I have made of any discussion upon the subject is one of a very short debate in 1812, when Sir John Newport proposed to repeal a tax which is sometimes quoted as a tax upon charities, which has, in certain cases, a limited bearing upon them, but which, as a general rule, is not felt to be a tax upon charities, for it is a tax upon estates—namely, the 10 per cent. paid upon legacies bequeathed to charities. On the 23rd of January, 1812, Sir John Newport moved for leave to introduce a Bill to exempt all bequests for charitable purposes from that duty. He was opposed by Mr. Perceval, who said it was not advisable to recognize the policy of encouraging bequests of the description alluded to—that is, deathbed bequests—because a person on his deathbed might give to a charity that portion of his property to which his immediate relations were entitled, and the Legislature was not called upon to administer to the wishes of such persons. That is the only declaration I have been able to find, although others may possibly have been more fortunate in their researches. Then we are now told that Sir Robert Peel is to be quoted as an authority for this exemption because he did not remove it. Sir Robert Peel removed from the income tax—and I can well concede, but I might venture to say, more than that—Sir Robert Peel refrained from mooted that of which he disapproved in his heart, because he did not think it wise to undertake what was entirely beyond his force to perform—he removed from the income tax a multitude of exemptions that would appear strange indeed in our eyes. There was the exemption of foreigners, and the opposition which he had to encounter in carrying his Income Tax Bill through the House showed that he had undertaken as much as it was possible for him to carry into legislative effect. But I am told that Sir Robert Peel was against the extension of income tax to charities. Why, Sir Robert Peel proposed by one of his Bills relating to charities—by a Bill introduced by Lord Lyndhurst on behalf of Sir Robert Peel's Government in the Session of 1845—he proposed a tax of 6*d.* in the pound upon charities—within one penny of the sum that would have to be paid at the present rate of income tax. The same objections were made then as now. The objection, in point of fact, is not so much the paying much or little as to paying anything. It is to the principle, in working, of that

exemption, and to the nature in general of exemptions, that I wish to call the attention of the Committee. In the first place, it is hardly possible to overrate the consequences of the misuse of words ; and I must venture, with the greatest respect, to suggest that there can hardly be an instance more marked of the truth of that proposition than the magic charm carried by the term "charities" as exempted from income tax. What are these charities ? I will venture to say that nineteen-twentieths of them at least—and I believe that to be an under-statement—consist of deathbed bequests. Now, deathbed bequests, in most countries, are, I believe, to a considerable extent restrained by the law. In our own country they are restrained by law when they take a particular diction. It is generally, and I think justly, considered a remarkable illustration of the mode in which freedom is left to the will and even to the caprice of individuals in this country that no attempt has been made to limit the amount of choice, of discretion, or of indiscretion, with which individuals may bequeath property to what is termed charitable uses. ("Hear, hear!") But, notwithstanding a cheer that proceeded from an hon. friend of mine opposite, I confess I am sanguine enough to anticipate an assent to my proposition when I say, that what a man wills on his deathbed, when he can no longer keep it in his own hands, is not charity in the same high fixed sense, nor, I will venture to say, in the only legitimate sense which it is when he gives what is his own to give or to enjoy. Upon a deathbed I do not deny that a man may have laudable motives ; but, on the other hand, I am sorry to say that sometimes he has motives which are not at all laudable. But let the motive be what it may, a man is giving in a particular manner that which it does not rest with him to retain. There is not a quarter of the charities of the country properly so called that is not taxed. Every voluntary gift of the living, everything saved by every man, everything recovered or gained by the severest self-denial, it may be out of an income which the giver might have enjoyed—all is taxed, and taxed without the smallest favour or regard. The charities of England are taxed, and bequests in England for charitable uses are relieved from taxation. Those two things are totally different. For charity, properly so called, you must have a giver as well as a receiver ; and where there is a giver as well as a receiver taxation is imposed without mercy or remission ; but where there has been a deathbed bequest, in the overwhelming majority

of instances, whatever may be the testamentary disposition, the law steps in and accords a preference that would more naturally be due to the alms of the living. I have said already that I do not admit that the 10 per cent. charged upon legacies is a tax upon charities. I conceive that in every case (except where the whole estate is bequeathed for charitable purposes) it is a tax upon the estate itself. If a man desires to give a particular sum to a particular charity, he gives it free of legacy duty ; or if he gives it without any such condition, he knows well that it is subject to the 10 per cent. deduction, and therefore it is his intention to give 10 per cent. less than the sum he names. I must say I do not think it is very wise for the State to give these temptations to making deathbed bequests. I proceed all along upon the assumption—nay, more than the assumption, upon the assertion—that an exemption is a gift. If that is contested, we differ on first principles ; but I think it is not a bold, or at all events, an audacious demand to make upon the reasoning faculties of the Committee, when I say that what the State remits to a man it gives to him. If a gentleman has carriages and horses, he is liable to pay a guinea for each horse, and two guineas or so for every carriage ; and if those sums be levied from his neighbour and not from him, it is the same thing as if they had not been levied on him, or had been given back to him. I dispute the general wisdom of giving these temptations to men by gifts of public money, to endeavour to immortalize themselves as founders. (“ Oh, oh ! ”) I may be wrong, but I state that opinion in accordance with the liberty of debate which exists in the House. And what do we do in that way ? We tell a man that he may gather wealth, and enjoy the accumulation till his death ; and that with that enjoyment he may also enjoy the merit of almsgiving by making a will which will not open until after his death, and that he may achieve the fame of being the founder of this or that institution ; when, if he had gone through the commonplace process of providing for others while he was living, his name after his death might have been consigned to obscurity. (“ Oh ! ”) I quite admit that there are many laudable motives which may actuate a man to leave bequests of that nature, but these men will have perfectly free scope if you leave them to act without a premium in the shape of an addition from the public money. It is to the addition of public money I object, and to which I desire to direct the attention of the Committee. I am free to confess that this is a point which

admits of a difference of opinion ; but a payment of public money for the purpose I have stated, which payment can only be obtained by levying it off the rest of the community, appears to me and my colleagues to be wrong in principle and dangerous in its consequences. I observed a sneer when I spoke of some of those bequests taking a direction that was not satisfactory, and the views I have stated seem to some to be remote and visionary. Sir, I am cognizant within my limited sphere of a case in which a sum of £150,000 was left for a charitable use for no other cause whatever than the aversion of the testator from his immediate relatives—for no other cause whatever. The real property of the testator was left to a stranger for the same reason. The relatives endeavoured to impeach the will on the ground of insanity, and naturally enough they failed. Here is another case :—I hold in my hand a letter which I received a few days ago, from a gentleman who pays income tax on a professional income. He states that J. D., by the peculiar construction of a will, obtained a fortune intended for his elder brother. This elder brother died and left a child ; J.D. died, and by a codicil executed a few days before his death gives the whole of his property to a public charity. I put it to the House that such charities as these are objects which it is neither politic nor just for the Legislature to encourage with gifts of the public money. I deny the justice of such a proceeding. I do not say the State ought to interfere with individual liberty so far as to intercept such bequests ; but I say not only that it ought not to add to those bequests by gifts of public money, but that when it does so, it commits an offence against the interests of the public and against the laws of justice with regard to the entire community. The case, then, of the “ charities ” of England as they are called, that is to say, of endowments for charitable uses, is that they are generally untaxed. There is an enormous exception, however, to this, in the case of the bequests for religious uses, which are taxed. On what principle of consistency such a difference is justified I do not know. Perhaps you think those charitable bequests are untaxed because what are called “ charities ” are generally distributed in sums under £100 a year. But the law is, that if the charity is distributed in sums over £100 a year it is exempt from taxation. There are cases of men having much more than £100 a year ; and those incomes being paid out of charities, according to the legal construction of charitable uses these men are exempt from taxation. The

State has, however, long thought that with respect to religious endowments it was desirable, owing to their nature, to pass laws with a view to limit their growth—such laws, for instance, as those for the emancipation of leaseholds and for the commutation of tithe. There have been no such enactments with regard to charitable bequests, and what some of these are we shall presently see. I will not speak of the minor inequalities in the law, such as its unequal distribution in the three countries. My hon. friend the Member for Clonmel<sup>1</sup> rose the other night and told me that this proposal of mine would be resented in Ireland. Certainly, I am at a loss to see why a proposal to change the existing system should be resisted in Ireland—it can only be on some peculiar view; for while that country pays 7 per cent. of the income tax, she only receives, as far as I can learn, 3 per cent. of the exemptions. A consequence of this system is that inequalities exist as to the distribution of the charges between the two countries. I do not wish, however, to dwell upon matters of that kind, which are not of great magnitude. I do dwell upon what I consider this great anomaly and inequality—namely, that no proof whatever of monies expended in charity by the living is admitted as a ground of exemption from income tax, while proof of monies so expended, if under the disposition made in a will by the dead, is received as ground of exemption. It is to be observed, that in the vast majority of cases, the testators who make these bequests are in reality only making an addition to voluntary subscriptions and donations, and, that instead of remaining in the nature of an endowment, the sums which they bequeath pass away with the annual expenditure of the institutions in whose favour they have been made. The charities of which I speak, almost the whole of which have come down from times remote, are now comparatively insignificant. They are charities in the nature of deathbed bequests, and as such they have enjoyed an entire immunity from taxation. The next question was, what was the cost to the State of these exemptions? He asked whether the Legislature was to accord to these posthumous bequests a pecuniary premium at the expense of the rest of the community; and he stated distinctly, that by according it that premium, the Legislature became responsible for all these bequests. It became a party to every one of them; and if there were among them those which were useless—those which were questionable—those which were mischievous—

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bagwell.

those which were scandalous—every one of those was endowed with a portion of public money. Perhaps it will be said that the operation of the present system is insignificant in its effects on the finances of the country. It will be well, at all events, to see what it does. The income of the United Kingdom from property may be estimated with considerable accuracy from the Returns for Income Tax. Of course, deductions must be made for those schedules which do not represent independent property. There must also be deducted from Schedule D an allowance for whatever is derived from manufacturing or professional skill and enterprise as apart from capital. With these deductions, the income of the United Kingdom may be stated at from £180,000,000 or £190,000,000 a year. Of that about a sixtieth part, or £3,000,000 a year, is possessed by charities, so called in the legal sense. The taxation imposed by our fiscal system on property, with the income tax at 7*d.* in the pound, amounts to about £13,000,000 a year. Of that the principal item is the income tax, yielding somewhat more than one-half. The next is that cluster of duties which, for convenience, may be called death duties—succession, probate, and legacy duties. The remainder is the house tax. From all these, charities are entirely exempt. The value of that exemption from the taxation laid upon other property, taking the proportion between the income of charities and the total income of the United Kingdom, is about £216,000 a year. Besides that, there is a large and a growing charge imposed upon the public for the sake of charities. I will not now enter into the minute details of the charge. As far as regards the sum of £18,000 a year voted upon the Estimates, it is obvious to the House. That sum is an increasing one; and there are several items of annual charge which it does not comprehend. For example, it does not include superannuations and offices; it does not include £500,000 which the State has been compelled to lay out within the last fifty years in order to examine into the state of things described by Lord Eldon as “a gross and general breach of trust,” and, if possible, to bring about an improved condition of affairs. To reimburse the State for its outlay upon charities would require an annual charge upon them of from £40,000 to £45,000 a year. The £216,000 which I have mentioned as the amount of their exemption from direct taxation amounts to about 7 per cent. upon their income. The reimbursement of the pecuniary charge laid upon the State would amount to 1½ per cent. more. The

total amount of the exemption which they enjoy is therefore  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., and the cost of the total amount to the State is fully £250,000 per annum. That amount is, in fact, part of the State expenditure. But if it is part of the State expenditure, I ask the Committee to consider why it is to be kept up in such a form? For many years we have been passing Bills and adopting administrative provisions, with a view to bringing the whole expenditure of the State, from time to time, within the control and under the eye of the House of Commons. If this money is to be laid out upon what are called charities, why is that portion of the State expenditure to be altogether withdrawn from view, to be shrouded within the folds of the most complicated sections of our Acts of Parliament, and to be so contrived that we shall know nothing of it and have no control over it; so that, while to every other object recognized by the State as fit to be provided for out of the public funds, we apply every year a vigilant eye with a view to modification or retrenchment, here we continue an exemption, and, pluming ourselves upon our liberality, we leave this great expenditure entirely in the dark, and waive in favour of these institutions, not only the receipt of a certain sum of money, but the application of all those principles of philosophical administration and constitutional control which we consider necessary for the general government of the country and the management of our finances? This is an important question. I should like to know what would have happened if in 1842, when Sir Robert Peel proposed the income tax, he had proceeded thus:—

“For convenience’ sake, and for the sake of knowledge and supervision, we think it wise that the eye of the State should be kept upon the administration of charitable bequests. The income tax, therefore, will be levied upon all their property irrespective of their charitable character. But we think the fund a sacred one, and are not disposed to interfere with it. The estimated amount of the income tax leviable from these sources would be £100,000. A levy will be made upon the property of the respective institutions, but we shall propose, as part of our miscellaneous expenditure, to vote annually £100,000 on behalf of these charities.” Suppose Sir Robert Peel had made that announcement, and, instead of mentioning £100,000 as the total amount of the exemption, had told us the whole state of the case. Suppose that at this moment we were to say, “We will levy the tax upon the property of charities as upon all other

property ; but because you think that deathbed bequests ought to have accorded to them a premium which you do not accord to the alms of the living, therefore, from year to year, £250,000 "—which I am certain is within rather than beyond the actual amount of the charge—" shall be distributed among these charities." Why, every man knows that such a Vote would not stand the scrutiny of a single year. It would be pulled to pieces more relentlessly and more mercilessly than the present proposal of Her Majesty's Government has been. You would have had it alleged that a multitude of these charities are bad, injurious, demoralizing, poisoning and sapping the principles and the independence of the poor—not one jot better, in many cases, than those old Poor Law doles which, at an epoch of courage and wisdom, the House of Commons swept away in 1834 under the guidance of Lord Grey's Government. The second point made would be the capricious, doubtful, and questionable nature of many more of these charities. The third would be, that even were these charities unobjectionable, and likely to do some good, unless they could show very extraordinary claims for public endowment, they should not be exempt ; and the residue, with respect to which you would be disposed to vote grants of public money, would not come near one-fourth part of the charities that are now in the enjoyment of this exemption of £250,000 per annum. I must say I have been struck by the skilful manner in which the charitable army, so to call it, has been marshalled. On all these occasions there is a great deal in the homely proverb of putting your best foot foremost. I have hardly heard a word since this proposal was made, except about the very best charities. The poor men that are to be dismissed from St. Bartholomew's, the orphans of the clergy who are to be sent away from their institution, the wives of Dissenting ministers who will lose their grants of £30 or £40 a year—all these sounds have rung in my ears. I do not complain of that ; but it is on account of these institutions that we are asked quietly to continue this promiscuous gift of a quarter of a million annually. I think it has been told of some Generals, who have been most skilful tacticians, that they have done much by a judicious distribution of their army. Sometimes you go to a review, and find the tall and the strong men in the front rank, and behind them are persons of very inferior material and dimensions. Sometimes, I believe, battles have been won by having old women and boys judiciously dressed up with the proper colours

and at the proper distance, and the moral effect has been what it was intended to be. So, in this case, what may be called the shameful or the doubtful charities have been kept in the shade and in judicious reserve. Therefore, it is necessary that we should have some analysis of these charities; for it is quite impossible that the Committee can attain to any clear idea of what we are about without such an analysis; and I think that when I have made that analysis, whatever the Committee may think of the proposal of the Government, they will say that we are not now inviting them to adopt any extreme proposition in the lenient compromise we are about to propose.

I am going to divide charities, for the purpose of this inquiry, into three classes—the small charities, the middle charities, and the great charities—assuring my hon. friend that I do this, not for the sake of symmetry, but for practical convenience, and because it will be found that the subject not unnaturally falls into those divisions. In small charities I include the funds of the large charities distributed in very minute amounts, for these fall within the scope of the observations I am now making. The middle charities generally administer relief in money, dealing with stipends of £20, £30, £40, or £50 a year—distributed, for the most part, to decayed gentlefolk, widows and orphans of clergy and Dissenting ministers, and persons generally within these middle regions. The larger charities require separate consideration. But what are we to say of the small charities? Sir, I say without hesitation, that there is scarcely one among them—a few there may be, but they are totally insignificant and infinitesimal—which, if we proposed in their favour a vote of 5s. in this House, would have that 5s. granted. Do not let me be pressed with the exception. I want to speak of the bulk of these charities; and I say, without hesitation, that if, as a mass, they deserve the toleration of this House, it is the very utmost they do deserve, and that to bestow upon them a public endowment is as gross an act of injustice as could well be committed by the Legislature. I ask again, what are these small charities? They are, for the most part, charities for local poor and for local education, and it is with respect to these charities that I say, that if they deserve that perfect freedom shall be given to a man to leave his money to them under whatever circumstances—it is the utmost that they do deserve. That is not my individual opinion alone. Three times have these charities been the subject of inquiry; and the Charity Commissioners

of Lord Brougham, the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834, and the Education Commissioners of two or three years ago, all condemned them, and spoke of them as doing a greater amount of evil than of good, in the form in which they are established. I received to-day a deputation—if, indeed, that word is not inadequate to describe it, whether I consider its numbers, or the materials of which it was composed; I leave it to others to say what it was—but the Bishop of London was a member of that deputation, and its demand was that the exemption which now exists should be continued as it is at present. The predecessor, however, of the Bishop of London was a Poor Law Commissioner in 1834, and in that capacity dealt with the question of these local charities for the poor. As a Commissioner, in 1834, he signed the Report of the Commissioners, and in it were these words—

“In some cases charitable foundations have a quality of evil peculiar to themselves. The majority of them are distributed among the poor inhabitants of particular parishes or towns. The places intended to be favoured by large charities attract, therefore, an undue proportion of the poorer classes, who, in the hope of trifling benefits to be obtained without labour, often linger on in spots most unfavourable to the exercise of their industry. Poverty is thus not only collected, but created in the very neighbourhood whence the benevolent founders have manifestly expected to make it disappear.”

That was the Report of the Commissioners in 1834. I need hardly go back to the Report of the Commissioners of 1818; and I do not suppose it will be thought necessary that I should bring before you the Report of the Commissioners in 1861. But, considering the astonishment that seems to be manifested on the other side at my stating that the existence of these minor charities was a doubtful matter, I trust the Committee will excuse my fortifying myself with authorities to show that in what I say, whether right or wrong, it is not the offspring of mere individual *ipse dixi*. In page 519 of the Report the Commissioners say—

“The hand of living charity is held out only to present need; it promises no periodical alms to indolence and importunity; and if it necessarily somewhat impairs the spirit of independence, it produces goodwill and gratitude. The ‘dead hand’ of the founder of an annual dole does not distinguish between the year of prosperity among the labouring classes and the years of distress; in prosperous years it leads those who are not in need to represent themselves to be so; it holds out annual hopes to improvidence; it more frequently excites jealousy and ill-feeling than goodwill, both on the part of the recipients towards the distributors of the charity and among the recipients themselves. For one person who

receives substantial benefit from these doles many feel their demoralizing effect. At Salisbury, for five vacancies in the list of pensioners on one charity there were sixty-two applicants, all of whom had probably nursed expectations more or less subversive of their industry, and used importunities more or less subversive of their self-respect."

I want to put to the Committee the real state of this case. You have a variety of towns particularly, and also certain country parishes, with so-called charities for their poor; and I wish to know upon what ground of justice the parishes which have no such charities for their poor—and in England those parishes are numerous, while almost all the parishes in Scotland and Ireland are in that position—I wish, I say, to know upon what ground all these parishes which have no such charities for their poor are to be called upon to add money out of their own pockets to enlarge the endowments of those favoured parishes in England? A more extraordinary and clear injustice than that, in my mind, cannot be conceived. I will take another case. An hon. friend of mine the other night, using language which I confess provoked a smile more than anything else, said that I betrayed my duty as a Member for the University of Oxford because I proposed a tax upon charities, by far the greater portion of which belong to the Church of England—thus propounding the doctrine that I, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, am under an obligation, before proposing a financial measure, to ascertain whether the fiscal incidence of that measure would be favourable or otherwise to the communion to which I belong, and to adopt or reject it accordingly. However, accepting the challenge of the hon. gentleman, I will take a class of charities which exist more or less all over the country—I mean charities to be dispensed upon the condition of attendance at Church. I have seen the working of these charities. I do not hesitate to say that they form the subject of great grief to many of the best men who have to administer them. They approximate to what I must call a sort of spiritual bribery, operating as an inducement to men to go to church for the sake of receiving temporal alms. It is a fact, of which there is abundant evidence in this book, that most of these who go to church for these purposes are not usually seen there at any time but on the occasions when the spiritual food is to be supplemented, as the Scotch say, by something which finds a shorter way to their perceptions and appetencies. I take the effect of these charities upon the tone of the population, because I feel that this justifies me in the assertion I have made, that these small charities, considered in

the mass, have no claim whatever to any indulgence or endowment beyond the toleration and protection which are afforded to property in general. I believe there is no city in this country which is richer in these charities than Coventry. Well, was there ever a case of a city where, upon the first arrival of distress, the labouring class were so immediately laid prostrate? Compare the case of Coventry, where these charities abound, with the case of the towns of Lancashire, in most of which they are comparatively few. Distress goes to Coventry, and before it has been there a month the whole country is solicited, and solicited with too good cause, to subscribe for its relief. Distress goes to Lancashire, and remains there for six, nine or twelve months before any appeal whatever is made to the public at large. Again, an application was made to me from Bristol on behalf of the "valuable charities" of that city; but according to evidence before us those charities are not "valuable." Instead of being valuable the Report of the Commissioners shows that they are pernicious. Mr. Cousins, vestryman of St. Paul's, Bristol, after forty years' experience of these matters, says—

"Small charities of from £1 to £6 pauperize the people; they destroy the sense of shame, and the deserving do not get them. The poor people (he adds) spend more time in looking after such gifts than would suffice to gain the same sums by industry."

And the very same evidence you may hear from the most judicious clergymen and administrators of alms in other parts of the country. The Education Commissioners of 1861 very naturally say—

"These charities, then, by their operation are teaching indolence, mendicancy, servility, and falsehood to the poor of Bristol, almost as effectually as industry, the love of independence, and veracity can be taught by means of the funds which the State supplies in aid of the Bristol schools."

I will trouble the Committee with one more case. I am not about to state that these small charities are generally scandalous. My statement is limited to this:—That they have no claim whatever upon the public purse, and that at the present moment, constituting as they do, as far as I am able to judge, not far short of one-half the annual so-called charities of this country, they are saddled on the public purse, if that calculation is correct, to the extent of £125,000 a year. I now take one of the cases which really deserves to be made known, however modest those connected with it may be. I refer to Jarvis's Charity. The

founder, poor man, could hardly have expected to obtain notoriety through the discussion of this House. Mr. Jarvis died in 1793, and left about £100,000 for the poor of three parishes in Herefordshire, to be given in various ways—for physic, clothing, food and so forth; but there was one thing to which he had a particular aversion—he absolutely forbade building. That was expressly precluded by the terms of his gift. I suppose his idea was to supply the current wants of the poor. The population of these three parishes, at the first census after Jarvis's death, taken in 1801 was 860, and in 1851 it was 1,222. What was the reason of this increase of population? Had employment increased there? No. Had trade come there? No. Had manufactures been established? No. Were wages higher in these parishes? No; they were lower by 2s. a week. Were the dwellings good? No; they were the most miserable and scandalous that disgraced any part of the country. The people went into them naturally enough to wait for the doles; for the gifts which by Jarvis's mistake and misguided benevolence were distributed to them pretty nearly double the income of the agricultural population of these parishes. And, last of all, have the morals of these poor people improved? The statement of the authorities who have investigated the case is this—that the morals of these parishes were such as they are forbidden to describe. And then, Sir, every £11 of Mr. Jarvis is to have a twelfth pound added to it by the State, which is to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpaying community! A more gross injustice, in my opinion, cannot be imagined. Well, this went on till it became perfectly intolerable, and the public nuisance could no longer be borne, fostered as it was by Parliament, and aggravated by the money taken from the contributions of the public. In 1852 an Act of Parliament was procured to place this particular charity on a better footing; but a great portion of the evil is still left in full force and vigour. The funds are still limited to the same three parishes; but what do the Committee imagine was the great remedy which the wisdom of the promoters of the measure devised? They desired to have power to lay out £30,000, or nearly one-third of the whole sum, in the very thing and the only thing which old Jarvis forbade—namely, in building. Those are the preposterous conclusions at which we arrive if we refuse to listen to the dictates of sound sense and moderation in these matters. £30,000 is a large sum and a great deal might be done with it. They might almost

build a University for the West of England ; and, if not a university, at any rate a great college. But what they are going to build is a boarding school for the children of the labouring population of these three parishes. The real meaning of this is, that the money of old Jarvis, supplemented by the money of the State, which we improvidently and unjustly take from the pockets of the taxpayers for the purpose, has grown to such a height that the trustees are driven to their wit's end to know what to do with it ; and just as was the case with the Donaldson Hospital at Edinburgh, they have entered into an immense deal of unnecessary building, because, like sensible men, they felt that in that way, if it did no good, it would be doing little harm. I could very easily entertain the Committee with more cases of this kind—striking and amusing, but, at the same time, on reflection, very painful cases. The Commissioners reported on the Canterbury charities, and among them is one called Lovejoy's Charity, part of which is to be applied to poor, ancient and sick people not receiving parochial relief. There were 500 persons receiving relief from this charity, and as to 113 of these the Commissioners could obtain no information ; but of the remainder there are 145, of whom they give the following account :—There are 51 persons in good employment, not needing relief, 36 paupers, who by the foundation are excluded from any such aid, 18 occasional paupers, 18 drunkards, 17 bad characters, 4 brothel-keepers, and one convicted felon. And yet to every £11 distributed by these charities £1 is added by Parliament, taken from the honest and laborious community. These small charities, I say, are not fit subjects for public endowment, and I am convinced, that if they were brought before Parliament in a proper and constitutional way, no one would venture to ask £1 per cent., nor even 1s. per cent., for a single one of them.

Let us come now to the middle charities, which may be said to be distributed in money—the smaller charities being distributed sometimes in money and sometimes in kind. I wish the Committee to see what have been the proceedings of the Government on this point, because it has been said that there is great inconsistency in removing the exemption from charities awhile, at the same time, we give exemptions to persons of less than £200 a year income. I draw a broad distinction between exemptions which are partial and are made in favour of particular persons, places, or classes, and exemptions which relate to the

entire mass of the community, and preserve a perfect equality between one man and another. Let us take the Clergy Orphan Association. It has an income of £5,000 from endowments, the income tax on which at 7*d.* in the pound would be £145 16*s.* 8*d.* That is the sum which we propose to take from this association. Who is it, I want to know, who make the "clergy orphans." I apprehend it is the poorer clergy—the clergy with incomes of from £100 to £200 a year. We take £145 from the funds applicable for the Clergy Orphans—not applicable as a matter of right, but as a matter of favour, of patronage, and of canvassing, which often costs a large percentage of the benefit gained—but what do we do for the poorer clergy? We have some means of getting at the incomes of the clergy. Perhaps the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire,<sup>1</sup> in his mild language, will say that we have robbed them; but let us see what we are actually doing for them. I reckon that there are 5,000 of the clergy of the Church of England with incomes between £100 and £150 a year, and 2,000 with incomes between £150 and £200; altogether 7,000 with incomes over £100 a year and under £200. If we take 5,000 at an average income of £125, and 2,000 at an average income of £175, the amount of remission of income tax to this class, by the proposition of Her Majesty's Government, will be £7,000. We take £145 from this institution of the Clergy Orphans, but we leave to the poorer Clergy £7,000 additional income, which would previously have come into the possession of the State. Again, the objection is taken that these charities are distributed—not uniformly, but usually in incomes under £100 a year; and the other possessors of incomes under £100 a year, it is said, do not pay income tax. With regard to the private and personal rights of the present possessors of these incomes the objection does not obtain, because with respect to them we propose to leave them in the position they now occupy and that they shall not be subject to any deduction. It has been said that that would be troublesome, but, on the contrary, it would be very easily worked by communication between the Charity Board and the Inland Revenue Office. Then, with respect to the future, how are we to consider the case of those who have now no right to the benefit of these charities, but may enter upon them at some future time? I want to make the comparison as fairly as possible, and I will therefore consider these future entrants as persons coming into incomes

<sup>1</sup> Mr. J. W. Henley.

derived from property in succession to one another. I do not wish to strain my argument, and will not dwell therefore on the fact that they are strangers to one another, but will take them simply as persons succeeding to one another upon death, and I will compare their position with that of those who have corresponding incomes not derived from charity, and who are exempt from the income tax. We are accused of inconsistency in taxing charitable incomes; but if you want logical consistency—if you want to deal equally—you must make people in the enjoyment of these incomes from charities pay not single, but double income tax. Suppose we take £2,000 private property, which, in the funds, would produce £65 per annum. A man succeeds to £2,000, and the succession passes from him to his child by death. Succession is calculated to come by death once in thirty years. The amount of succession and probate duty, with the charges necessarily incident, has been ascertained, on inspection of a number of wills by a most able and accurate authority, to be 12 per cent. upon the capital of the property. That would take from the possessors of the non-charitable income of £65, 12 per cent. on the capital sum of £2,000, or £240 once in thirty years—that is £8 5s. a year, which is equal to an income tax of 2s. 6d. in the pound. On the other hand it is now proposed to take from the charitable income of £65 a tax of 7d. in the pound, which amounts to 455 pence, or £1 17s. 11d. in the year, in lieu of the £8 paid by the non-charitable income of the same amount in the form of death duties. If I were competent to deal with this subject legally, I should be justified in saying that we have no right to look at future recipients at all; but the result is that upon these small properties is levied a tax, not all coming into the coffers of the State, but all inevitably and practically incidental to bringing into the coffers of the State what comes there, more than four times as much as we now propose to levy upon corresponding amounts derived from charitable funds.

I now come to the larger charities, which may be considered as falling under two classes, one represented by Christ's Hospital, a great charity of education, and the other consisting of what I frankly admit to be the best of all these charities—namely, the great endowed hospitals. I hope the Committee will grant me its indulgence while I deal with the case of Christ's Hospital, because that institution is under the most illustrious patronage, and I have no doubt that those connected with it exercise their powers upon enlightened principles and with the best intentions.

My proposition is, that while the public contribute about £2,000 a year to the funds of the charity, Christ's Hospital is not entitled, upon any ground of right or public policy, to receive a single shilling. Christ's Hospital was founded for the very poorest of the poor.

“ Our Sovereign Lord the King, of his mere mercy, has pity and compassion on the miserable state of the poor fatherless and motherless children, the sick, the sore, and the impotent ; ” and so on.

Such are the terms of the original charter of Christ's Hospital. Where are these sick and sore and impotent people ? They have gradually improved in their circumstances and worked upwards in society with the increasing wealth of the institution, and now they are the children of people with £200 a year, with £300 a year, with £400 a year, and in some cases with £500 a year. I deny that such people are for one moment entitled to call upon Parliament for a vote of public money in aid of the education of their children ; and if we could but get at the truth, if we could but get rid of these exemptions, if we had to consider the matter as a portion of our annual expenditure, no man would dare to stand at this table and ask the House to vote £5,000 or £500 or even £5 a year for such an institution as Christ's Hospital. But what is the nature of Christ's Hospital ? It is an institution with an income of nearly £70,000 a year. I have no means of ascertaining the precise amount ; but, as I was told to-day upon the highest authority, that if we imposed this tax, we should get about £2,000 per annum from Christ's Hospital, I infer that the income of the institution must be something like £70,000 a year. It must be more, indeed, because we already get income tax from the recipients of salaries, if they do duty for their money ;—for it is essential to the definition of a charity, so as to exempt it from the income tax, that the recipients should do nothing whatever in return for what is given to them. It is a charity where a man receives money because he is the descendant of somebody else, or because he is a poor Knight of Windsor—a man cannot be called upon to pay income tax if he shows that he does nothing for his income. Christ's Hospital, I believe, has 500 Governors, who come into their offices upon the payment of £500 each. What splendid benevolence ! Is it not a noble and spirit-stirring reflection that you can find in this country ten or a dozen men every year to pay £500 each for the benefit of this institution ? What is the real truth ? Are these sums of £500 each given out of pure

charity? Do the Governors get nothing in return? No, Sir, not exactly. They get a vested right in 1,600 presentations—presentations to some £70,000 a year of endowed property. I am not proposing a revolutionary measure; I am not seeking to take money from the hospital; I am simply asking that we should not have to give another £2,000 a year out of the public purse. I am told that the Governors will have to dismiss a number of the boys. I am sceptical upon that point. The same cry has been raised over and over again. During the last twenty years, since I began to hold office, every beneficial financial change had been met with a threat that somebody would be dismissed. The statement that some boys will be dismissed does not command my belief; but if they were to be dismissed, I deny that it is the business of Parliament to give public money in order to educate the children of rich people, and to extend at the public charge the patronage enjoyed by the Governors of Christ's Hospital. Take the case of the Charter House. It is customary to make Prime Ministers Governors of that institution. My noble friend near me is a Governor of the Charter House, and (VISCOUNT PALMERSTON nodded assent) he admits it. I know that I have his assent when I say that his patronage should not be augmented by a public grant. The remission of the income tax in such cases is a gross abuse—an abuse which would not survive a single Session, if instead of compelling us to deal in the dark by way of exemptions, you were to come honestly forward and make your appeal to Parliament for a grant to these charities as a legitimate portion of the public expenditure. But so much has been said about the excellent nature of these institutions that I must return for a moment to Christ's Hospital. I am utterly sceptical as to the unmixed and unbounded benefits conferred by such schools. Here are vast masses of 1,200 or 1,500 small boys gathered together for the purposes of education—no doubt the younger boys are sent down to Hertford—they are not subject to any of those great beneficial influences that are necessary to maintain a pure atmosphere and a healthy tone in every school—first, the press; secondly, the public; and thirdly, the parents. I distrust the usefulness of such schools—parents ought to have more influence over them. But though I think these schools are to be condemned, it is not my business to bring an indictment against them—it is the menace of the dismissal of forty boys which compels us to examine into these things, and to see whether

there is a claim on the part of such a foundation as Christ's Hospital to be improved to the extent of one-twelfth of its income by a grant taken out of the pockets of the tax-paying community. Here I am bound to say that those connected with the Hospital have not exhibited any desire to keep back anything ; and I find it stated by the Education Commissioners that the Treasurer gave his evidence before them in a frank, open, ingenuous manner. The faults of the institution are chargeable, not to them, but to causes and circumstances over which they had no control. But the Committee must hear the real state of the case. I have said that the presentations are the patronage of the Governors, almost approaching to the character of private property. The Education Commissioners say—

“ They are so absolute that it is doubtful whether the Hospital has legal power to refuse any child presented by a Governor, however unqualified for admission in point of knowledge the child may be.”

Mr. Gilpin, the Treasurer, says—

“ We have been inundated with children who did not know their letters ; the result of which has been that it has been very detrimental to the school.”

He adds—

“ We have had children who, after they have been at Hertford for two years, have hardly been able to spell. We positively were met on one occasion, when a child came for admission, with the fact that he really did not know his letters. I asked the mother what she could be about, she being the mistress of a national school, and I said ‘ What can be the reason of this ? ’ The reply was, ‘ We knew he was to have this presentation, and therefore we did not take the trouble to educate him at all.’ ”

Mr. Gilpin also states that the gift boys from different parishes were better educated than those who have been put in by the donation Governors. The Governors kicked at this state of things, and passed a resolution that no child should be admitted unless he could read fluently the four Gospels. One Governor argued against the resolution in this way :—“ I have made myself a Governor ; and if I choose to send my boy to this large charitable school, it is your duty to educate him.” The solicitor was consulted as to whether a Governor could insist on sending a boy who could not read at all, and the answer which he returned was that he thought the matter doubtful. I do not think it is doubtful whether it is just and fair that the tax-paying community should be required to pay £2,000 a year towards the maintenance of Christ's Hospital. I will compare Christ's

Hospital, for the sake of illustration, with another charity in London. There seemed to be very great hesitation on the other side when I asserted what seemed to me a very simple proposition, that the alms of the living stand on a higher footing than the bequests of the dead. But I presume no one will assert that the alms of the living ought not to be treated worse than the bequests of the dead. Let us take the case of King's College. No person connected with King's College has ever exercised an act of patronage, or any act which can be so called. King's College was founded thirty years ago. The funds include £90,000 from donations, £50,000 from shares, and £15,000 from endowments. There is no competition between the interests of the shareholders and the interests of the institution; but it is provided that when all the purposes of the College are fulfilled the shareholders may receive a profit of 4 per cent. They have never received a shilling. They have created an excellent college, with an excellent school, occupying a high position among schools. King's College has taken its place among the permanent educational establishments of the country. It is not disputed that every shilling has gone to a charitable purpose, but they have never received one shilling return of income tax on anything which they possess, and by a recent decision the buildings are to be charged as upon a rental of £1,370, on which income tax will be payable. That is the consistency—that is, I would almost say, the decency which fattens bloated institutions at the expense of the public, and leaves struggling ones to make their way in the world as best they can. The case of the hospitals, properly so called, is by far the best—and in hospitals I include everything which embraces the relief of involuntary ailments—dispensaries, infirmaries, and lunatic asylums. Hospitals probably amount to nearly one-fourth of the whole of the charities, and they give the best case, because they involve so little of the vicious and corrupting element of patronage. When we speak of a charity, as a general rule, we speak of some administrator or dispenser of charity who derives consequence and importance from managing that charity which he would not otherwise possess. But in the case of hospitals, within the limits of certain distances, their doors are open to all who suffer from poverty, misery and disease, and patronage does not exist. There is no fear of stimulating disease by a multiplication of hospitals, and there is no waste in canvassing. It is perfectly true that in the case of many charities the candidates spend more in the canvass

than the presentation is worth. But in the case of hospitals there is no canvassing, there is no expectancy, there is no fraudulent pretence, there is no ill-will. Dr. Chalmers, the man perhaps of all others in this country who most happily united a high character for benevolence with the character of a sound political economist, was not ashamed to say, that while he proscribed most of the foundations termed charitable, he admitted that great benefits were derived from hospitals. For this very reason the want of hospitals is more easily supplied by voluntary contributions, and I believe, that if any calamity swept from the surface of the earth the great and wealthy endowed hospitals, the liberality of the public would immediately supply accommodation for all who require it. I will take the instance of St. Bartholomew's, in respect of which this proposal to impose the income tax is thought to be very cruel. The income is £36,000 a year. The income tax paid should be £1,050. The sum paid upon salaries is about £200 a year. The benefit which St. Bartholomew's has had, at the expense of those especially who pay income tax, has been about £850 a year. During the last twenty years, after allowing for the investment of fresh capital, landed income has improved 8 per cent. About £150,000,000 have been contributed in the form of income tax by the community in order to bring about those changes which have been—I do not say the sole—but the most important agents in bringing about that improvement. In 1841 the income of St. Bartholomew's was £31,335. In 1862 it is £36,030, being an increase of £4,695. It is an increase of 15 per cent., or about double the increased rate of improvement of land generally. It is due partly to the sale of property to railways in choice situations, and partly to improved administration, brought about by legislation. But it is fair to assume, that independent of those causes, the increase has been 8 per cent. I also assume that one half of the increase of the value of landed property is owing to the increased activity of trade and commerce, through commercial legislation and the increased value of the most important products of land. Therefore, I say that St. Bartholomew's is debtor to the income tax 4 per cent., or £1,440. What, on the other hand, are the benefits which St. Bartholomew's has received? It consumes 2,246 lbs. of tea a year, and the reduction in the duty on tea is equal to a fresh endowment of £192 14s. 7d. The reduction on sugar and treacle is equal to a fresh endowment of £82 15s.; on soap, to £26 2s. 6d.; on butter and eggs, to £141 2s. 3d.; on spirits,

to £98 15s. 10d. ; and on wine, to no less than £288 13s. The drugs and medicines are valued at £4,150 a year ; and although I have been unable to ascertain the amount of which these articles have been relieved, I think 10 per cent. is a moderate estimate, and that gives an additional endowment of £415. That makes a relief of £1,245 a year to St. Bartholomew's on those seven articles alone. If you add 50 per cent., or £622, which is a most moderate estimate, for the saving on all the other articles of food, clothing, building materials, and so on, you will find that St. Bartholomew's is a debtor to the income tax to the amount of £1,867 a year on account of duties reduced on articles of consumption, and £1,440 on account of enhanced value of property. Altogether, therefore, £3,307 of direct pecuniary benefit is received by St. Bartholomew's from the income tax ; while £850 is all that the proposal of the Government would require it to contribute to the general purposes of the State. I really know but one answer to that proposal. It is that St. Bartholomew's, being an establishment for the relief of the most miserable class of the community, ought to receive a public subvention. The income tax, as I have shown, has given the institution £3,300 and now we ask for £850—leaving a balance of £2,450 still to the credit of the income tax. I repeat, the only argument against taking that £850 is that the Hospital deserves a grant. It was not my intention to make any remarks on the management of hospitals of this kind, which we must all regard with so much favour and respect ; but when at every turn the threat is flung in my face, that if this measure is carried out, the number of patients must be diminished, then I am obliged to give some attention to this part of the subject. I do not believe that the number of patients will be reduced, and I do not meet any evidence that such a step will be necessary. Those who, in the case of the protected trades, declared that if protection were withdrawn, they must dismiss so many of their workmen, were not men who told lies. They really believed what they said—they were merely not aware that more economical arrangements would enable them to keep their workmen, pursue their trade, and make larger profits than before. One of the great evils of the present system is, that while you bestow public money on these establishments, you dispense with all public control over them, and thus annul all effective motives for economical management. Endowed institutions laugh at public opinion. There is no public opinion brought to bear upon them. The press knows nothing of their expenditure ; Parliament knows

nothing of it. It is too much to say that hospitals are managed by angels and archangels, and do not, like the rest of humanity, stand in need of supervision, criticism, and rebuke. Therefore, even in the case of St. Bartholomew's, I object to an exemption, which, by its very nature, at once removes the principal motives for economical management. When the managers tell me that the exaction of £820 will compel them to dismiss 500 patients, I am entitled to ask, "Why, then, do you spend £220 in a feast; what right have you to eat up in an hour 150 cases?" I confess I am amazed at the skill with which my opponents have put their best foot foremost. Their tactics and strategy have been admirable; but their case will not bear close scrutiny. What are the circumstances of Guy's, of St. Thomas's, and similar establishments? Every year they are able to place out £3,000 or £4,000 each in reproductive investments in land. They are thinking not merely of the sick, but of their own future aggrandizement and extension. My hon. friend the Member for Bath<sup>1</sup> informed me the other day that St. Thomas's spends 15 per cent. of its income in improvements on its land. Well, then, it is a matter for the State to consider whether the indefinite enrichment of such corporations—even of those instituted for the best of purposes—when entirely removed from the control of public opinion, the press, or Parliament, is to go on without limit, and is to be augmented by contributions from the public purse. I do not believe that a single patient will be dismissed from one of the hospitals of London if this proposal is agreed to; but if there were the slightest apprehension of such an occurrence, private charity would at once supply the void. I am willing to make a greater admission. A public grant might be given to replace the loss. Why not? It has never been thought that the relief of the sick, desirable as it is, was a proper subject for a grant from the exchequer of the country; but it might be thought otherwise. I do not give any opinion on the matter; I express no foregone conclusion. All I say, and I challenge contradiction, is that a public grant to such an establishment as St. Bartholomew's would be ten times better than an exemption like the present. When there is a public grant we know what we are about—we let in the light of day. The public becomes a party to the management; it has something to say and has a right to be heard, and arbitrary will is dethroned. There is another matter much more important. Are the sick poor of London exclusively maintained by endowed

<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. Tite.

hospitals? Are there no unendowed hospitals? What is King's College Hospital, University College Hospital, Charing Cross Hospital, or St. George's Hospital? (LORD ROBERT CECIL : St. George's is endowed.) St. George's is, I believe, in the main supported by voluntary contributions, but it may have a handful of endowment. Let it be granted, for the sake of argument—what has never yet been suggested—that Parliament ought to make a present of some thousands a year towards the care of the sick poor of London. Then, I ask, is it just, is it politic, is it rational, that the grant should be confined to institutions which possess £20,000, £25,000, £30,000, and £35,000 a year, and which are in no degree influenced by opinion from without? Or is it not more just and rational that the money, instead of being given to great and wealthy establishments, should go in part, if not altogether, to the smaller and struggling institutions, some of which cannot always keep their beds open to the sick? The effect of the present exemption is, that to those who have, more is given, while from those who have not, something is taken away. For instance, King's College Hospital is taxed, for it depends on voluntary subscriptions, and its management is subject to the opinion of the subscribers and of the public. We, as a constitutional Parliament, are bound, I think, if the hospitals are to receive a grant, to bring them within our control. In these cases the tax takes away from a fluctuating income. Subscribers may drop away, the income may fall off; and I say, that if it be right to give money for the support of the sick poor, it is wrong to the great mass of the people that you should give it to richly-endowed institutions in the form of a blind exemption. It may, perhaps, be said in answer, that what the Government proposes to do is very insufficient. It is not, perhaps, an effectual mode of dealing with such a case as Jarvis's Charity. In fact, it is a very modest proposal. We ask to withdraw only so much of the public subvention as can be withdrawn without involving ourselves in hopeless practical difficulties. The application of the death duties to these charities would be more consistent; but these would eat into the *corpus* of the charity.

Before I sit down I must call attention to the rapid growth of charity estates. Strange to say, it appears to me that the property of the charities is increasing in value more rapidly than the property of the community at large. The income of charities, as returned by the original Commission, between 1818 and 1837, was £1,209,000. In 1862 it had risen to £3,000,000. By our

remissions we can trace and verify the estimate to £2,666,000, but there is other property which brings the value up to the amount I have named. Consequently, if the charity property has increased in value 250 per cent., it has increased in an exceptionally rapid manner. How is this to be accounted for? I believe it may be accounted for in this way. The chief donors of charities have been citizens, and the great bulk of the land which they have bestowed, being in the neighbourhood of towns, has shared in a pre-eminent degree in the general rise in value of landed property. I will not go back to Jarvis's Charity; but there is in Monmouth a charity called Jones's Charity, which educates 100 boys. It has 320 acres of land at Deptford, and its income will be, I am told, after no large number of years, enormous. There is at Tunbridge a school which educates, at an expense of £4,000 a year I believe, 200 young gentlemen—how these young gentlemen can be objects of charity I do not know—and it is estimated that before the lapse of any very long time the lands of the charity will be worth £80,000 per annum. There is also Smith's Charity at Kensington—and I may here observe that I asked particularly the magnificent assemblage which I had the honour of receiving in Downing Street to-day whether their request related solely to the London hospitals, or to the whole mass of miscellaneous charities, and was answered by a loud buzz from all parts of the room, conveying the unequivocal affirmation that it was their wish that all those charities should be held sacred from a tax which I am every day compelled to wring from poor and destitute people who are not so fortunate as to be connected with such endowments. When the working man appeals to me on behalf of wife and children, and because of empty purses, fever, and sickness of all sorts, I am obliged to turn a deaf ear—I may not pity him—because I can make no deduction to them in the payment of money required for the purposes of the State. But to return to Smith's Charity. Smith, like other men, went the way of all flesh, having bequeathed his property for all time to his poor relations. Now what, let me ask, is the consequence of bequeathing property to poor relations? Not unfrequently to hold out to them an inducement to adopt a mode of life which makes them poor. Is it, let me ask, in the interest of morality that a young man, who has the world before him, and who has tastes and appetites which render him disinclined to work, should know that if he exerts himself, and that if his honourable industry be crowned with success, then he passes beyond the care of his

progenitor ; while, if he is only idle, profligate, and dissipated enough to become poor, he will come in for a portion of Smith's Charity ? (SIR JOHN PAKINGTON intimated dissent.) The right hon. Baronet sneers ; but what are the facts of the case ? Can he deny the truth of that which I have just stated ? (SIR JOHN PAKINGTON : Dissipation is not a condition of the Charity.) No ; but poverty is a condition, and dissipation but too often leads to poverty. I ask the House, then, with confidence whether it is in accordance with sound policy and the principles of morality that a charity like that of Smith should, for a given number of pounds to be disposed of according to the founder's caprice, receive an additional pound from the coffers of the State ? I am informed, that when the leases of the charity property fall in, in some limited number of years before the close of the century, the income will be £150,000 a year ; and taking this with the increase of other charities, the exemption, which now amounts to a quarter of a million, will reach to half-a-million a year.

Sir, I have delayed the House long. Although I may have felt that it was on the present occasion my lot to address an adverse assembly, yet I have deemed it to be my duty as a Minister of the Crown not to shrink from the discharge of the obligation which was imposed upon me, to show that neither my colleagues nor myself took up this proposition lightly, or without due consideration. I am convinced, moreover, that in inviting public attention to ground hitherto almost untrodden, although particular interests may produce a momentary pressure, this discussion will not be without its fruits. I have stated that it is only by a licence of speech that the name of charities can be extended to deathbed bequests, even when applied to useful purposes. I have stated that the charities of England are not at this moment exempt, the exemption being confined to particular institutions. I have stated that the growth of these charities is more rapid than the wealth of the rest of the country ; that many of them have been declared on good authority to be indifferent, and many bad. I have shown that the plan of the Government would subject the middle charities—which I admit to be generally good—to less than half taxation as compared with private property under certain circumstances ; and that in the case even of the smaller charities, if they had any claim for a public grant, it was monstrous to make such a grant by way of an exemption, which selects for favour institutions which do not want, and leaves to struggle those which stand most in need of assistance. The proposition

which I have made we do not submit to the House as a matter of financial necessity ; we offer it to your notice as a just measure. I will say nothing now of the hard words which have been applied to it ; but of this I am sure, that no one would have given to it a more cordial or conscientious support than he who so lately sat upon this bench, and whose loss we so deeply lament—

“ Justissimus unus  
Qui fuit in Teucris, et servantissimus æqui.”

We propose this, then, as a measure of justice. We do not presume as a Government, by the means which a Government may exert, to press it upon an adverse House. The House must be responsible for its rejection. We desire to defer to the opinion of the House. We do not wish to show any undue obduracy. We will reserve to ourselves the right to consider in what way the subject ought hereafter to be dealt with if the House should not now wish to accept this proposal at our hands. But we at the same time urge its adoption on the House as a measure sound in principle—as a measure in conformity with the spirit which has guided the proceedings of Parliament for the last twenty years—as a measure just to the tax-paying community, and, above all, the labouring poor, to elevate whose character and to improve whose condition is one of the main objects of legislative action. In proposing such a measure we feel ourselves to be impregnable against all petty arts and reproaches, and we commend it with confidence to the justice, the equity, the courage, and the wisdom of the House of Commons.

## THE REFORM BILL OF 1866

### REPLY AT THE END OF THE DEBATE ON THE SECOND READING

APRIL 27, 1866

At the General Election of 1865 Lord Palmerston, who had been Prime Minister continuously since 1859, obtained a substantial majority, which was roughly classed as Liberal, though it might more properly have been called Palmerstonian. Palmerston, however, did not survive to meet the new Parliament in February, 1866. In October, 1865, a few weeks after the end of the elections, he died, and Lord Russell succeeded him as Prime Minister. Gladstone, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, became Leader of the House of Commons, and introduced a Reform Bill which would have lowered the Parliamentary franchise for boroughs in the direction, though not to the extent, of household suffrage. The Bill was not a large one, and according to official estimates would not have enfranchised more than half a million men. It excited, however, a good deal of discontent among the Whig section of the Liberal party, who found a vehement and eloquent spokesman in Mr. Robert Lowe. They were supported by the whole body of the Conservative Opposition, led by Mr. Disraeli, and the combination was almost equal to the forces of the Government. But they did not oppose the main principle of the Bill. They preferred, at least on the second reading, to take the line that it was incomplete, and proposed an amendment declining to pass it on the ground that it was not accompanied by a Redistribution Bill. The debate, as might have been expected, very soon departed from the subject of redistribution, and Lowe in particular directed a spirited diatribe against democratic government. He also maintained that the House of Commons had been since 1832 thoroughly and sufficiently representative of all classes in the community. It was against Lowe, and his theory of class representation, that Gladstone chiefly levelled his great speech on the second reading of the Bill. He denied that the House of Commons could be justified by efficiency alone. Unless the people at large believed that it represented their interests, it would not command their confidence and respect. The great Reform Act had saved the country from revolution in 1832 by enfranchising the middle class. But for the operative class, the class of manual labour, it had done next to nothing. Gladstone lays down the proposition that a British subject residing in the United Kingdom is entitled to come within the pale of the Constitution by the exercise of a vote unless his unfitness may in some way be proved. His broad and unqualified doctrine goes a good deal further than the Bill, further than household suffrage itself, and its immediate effect may not have been favourable to the measure, which was carried on the second reading by a very small majority, and afterwards wrecked in Committee. The result was altogether unexpected. Lord Russell resigned, Lord Derby came into office, and in 1867 Mr. Disraeli carried through the same House of Commons

a Bill which, as finally amended with his own acquiescence, established household suffrage pure and simple for every borough in the United Kingdom. This strange issue is enough to give the present speech a peculiar interest of its own, and the occasion is also memorable as being the first on which Gladstone definitely adopted the creed of the Liberal party.

**A**T last, Sir, we have obtained a clear declaration from an authoritative source ; and we now know that a Bill which in a country with five millions of adult males (“ Oh, oh ! ” “ Hear, hear ! ” *and cries of* “ Order ! ”). Am I to be permitted to proceed ? (“ Hear, hear ! ” *and renewed cries of* “ Order ! ”)—and we now know that a Bill which in a country with five millions of adult males proposes to add to its present limited constituency 200,000 of the middle class and 200,000 of the working class is, in the judgment of the leader of the Tory party, a Bill to reconstruct the Constitution on American principles.

Sir, I rise after one o'clock in the morning to review, as well as I am able with the aid of this declaration, a debate which has continued through eight nights. And first, Sir, I would gladly have passed by the defence, as he calls it, and as I must presume he thinks it, which the right hon. gentleman has made for himself and for his friends with reference to the history of the past twenty or thirty years. I have no desire to interfere in that controversy. I will not attempt to follow him through its details ; it will require from me only the briefest notice as to its general scope. I have too much respect for the time of the House to weary it, at this hour, with matters which it is in my power to avoid ; and I must say that I have too much respect for the judgment of the House, and for the judgment of those elsewhere who will become acquainted with our proceedings, to have the slightest apprehension that any one of the mistakes or any one of the misrepresentations consequent on the mistakes, which have proceeded from the right hon. gentleman, will have an influence on the House or on the people.

Now, Sir, I am afraid that I must begin by owning that I have much to say. I will endeavour, however, to consult the convenience of the House by clearing out of the way at the outset some misapprehensions which the right hon. gentleman has assisted to propagate, and which have prevailed on the other side during this debate ; to these I will refer exceptionally, because I think they have considerably obscured the general issue.

In the first place, I must presume to say a word upon the subject of the references which have been made to a great name

among us in this House and in the country—I mean the name of Lord Palmerston. It has been assumed by gentlemen who are supporters of the Amendment that they honour the memory of Lord Palmerston by describing him either generally as the enemy of Reforms, or specially as the enemy of Parliamentary Reform. Or again, and yet more specifically, by describing him especially as the enemy of that which constitutes the essential point and the very hinge of the whole framework of this Bill ; namely, a reduction of the borough franchise. Now, Sir, to throw light upon this subject, I will read but a few words which Lord Palmerston used in supporting his own Bill in 1860. He said, that the provisions of that Bill were open, as without doubt the provisions of our Bill, and of every other Bill, are open, to consideration in Committee ; but he went on to use these words, “ there are certain fundamental principles in the Bill which we could not consent to have infringed, because that would destroy the measure altogether.” One main principle of the Bill is, the reduction of the borough franchise. It has been assumed by some speakers, that the life of Lord Palmerston was a security against the introduction of a measure of Reform. I think it no less due to Lord Palmerston than to his colleagues to say that, as far as I am aware—and I presume the right hon. gentleman will admit that if mischief of any kind had been brewing in the Cabinet I probably should have known it—there never was a difference of opinion between Lord Palmerston and his colleagues on the question of Reform. In my own judgment, we underwent a great responsibility in regard to the measure of 1860. The introduction of that measure was an important step in redemption of a very solemn pledge which might almost have been termed the basis of our official existence at the time. The abandonment of that measure probably must have taken place at some period of the Session in the state of affairs in which we stood ; yet it was a matter difficult to determine as to the precise time and circumstances. I admit that in that abandonment we underwent a great responsibility. Differences of opinion there might have been to it ; but I know of no Member of the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston who ever thought that, after the abandonment of that measure, and considering the circumstances which prevailed from the year 1860, down to the dissolution of last year, it would have been wise or warrantable for the Cabinet to have revived the subject of Reform. The right hon. gentleman quotes, and grossly, I must say, misquotes, a speech of mine on the subject of the suffrage : no, Sir, I will not

say he misquotes it, for he did not refer to my actual words, but I will only say he misstates the effect. The right hon. gentleman, however, if he recollected that speech at all, might have recollected that in that speech I declared that in my opinion it would be wrong for the Government to introduce or take up the question of Parliamentary Reform, till there should have arrived such a state of public opinion as might seem to afford a prospect of success. That, I believe, was all along the unanimous opinion of the Cabinet. It has been observed, indeed, that my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Home Department declared last year that we did not make our appeal to the country as the patrons of a great measure of Reform. Certainly not ; we tendered no such profession. We left the country to pronounce its own impartial judgment ; and we waited, in the state of things I have referred to, for spontaneous indications of the public mind with regard to the representation of the people in Parliament. But my right hon. friend himself has stated that when the elections had taken place he individually formed the opinion, which, as far as I know, was the opinion formed by the other Members of the Cabinet, that the Manifestations which had been given by the country, and by candidates when appealing to the constituencies, in respect to Parliamentary Reform, had brought again before us the very occasion on which it was our duty to become responsible for another measure of Reform. Nor have we the smallest right, the smallest ground, to suppose that Lord Palmerston differed from that opinion. We cannot, indeed, say that he agreed in it ; and why ? Because, at the moment of his lamented death, no single Cabinet had been held for the purpose of considering the measure to be adopted during the coming Session. But I do chance to know, and it is a posthumous record of some interest, that Lord Palmerston had a conversation with one, at least, of his colleagues at no very long period before his death—it may have been a twelvemonth, or even more ; I cannot further define the time—on this very subject. I have not the smallest doubt in my mind, though I cannot state it as a matter of fact, that he was looking forward to the dissolution as the critical period when a fresh decision would have to be taken. In that consideration he stated his opinion that within a limited time it would be right for the Government again to introduce the subject of Reform. So much, Sir, for the honour of Lord Palmerston, which I confess I think has not been in the most judicious hands during the chief part of this debate. That opinion, I hope, may be expressed without offence,

and without transgressing in letter or in spirit the rules of Parliament.

Now, I come to another subject again of a personal character, and one with which the House has been made perhaps sufficiently familiar during our long discussion. I refer to my hon. friend the Member for Birmingham.<sup>1</sup> It has been made a charge against the Government that they are identified with my hon. friend. It is admitted that we are the nominal Ministers of the Crown, but it is confidently or boldly declared that he is its irresponsible, yet its real adviser. To such a charge, couched in such terms, I shall make no reply whatever. Such persons as are disposed to admit it must have minds in a position entirely inaccessible, I will not say to deliberative reason or justice, but, at any rate, to any observations I can offer. In truth, such things are said, not to convince, nor to persuade, but if not to bewilder, at least to sting. But more specific charges have been made, and these it is right that, as Her Majesty's servants, we should notice. It has been stated that my hon. friend the Member for Birmingham has been the adviser of this Bill. On that subject, inasmuch as it raises an issue of facts, and is therefore one which admits of being dealt with, let us consider what has really taken place. And I may preface my statement with this remark, that in my opinion, as well as in the opinion so gracefully, as well as manfully expressed by my hon. and learned friend the Member for Exeter,<sup>2</sup> it would have been no disgrace to the Government, if policy had appeared to recommend it, that they should have consulted the great organs of opinion in the different sections of their party with respect to the best method of framing a plan of Parliamentary Reform. Had that method been pursued, it would have been impossible to overlook—it would have been culpable if, through cowardice, they had refrained from consulting—my hon. friend the Member for Birmingham. But Her Majesty's Government felt no such necessity; and, as far as I am aware, did not in any manner or degree pursue that course of consultation. They did feel that, responsible as they had been for the formation and the introduction of previous Reform Bills, and being, most of them, not wholly inexperienced in conducting the affairs of a Government, they had sufficient confidence in themselves, sufficient knowledge of the state of the public mind, and sufficient sense of their own responsibility to form their own opinion on the leading

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. J. D. Coleridge.

provisions fit to be embodied in a measure of Reform. We were, indeed, aware of the opinions of the hon. Member for Birmingham <sup>1</sup> just as much, I believe, as, and no more, than the gentlemen opposite were aware of them. And I apprehend that we were aware of them through the same unfailing channels—namely, the public journals of the country. What we understood to be his opinions he stated in some speech delivered by him, I rather think at Rochdale, during the autumn, we conceived them to be as I will now state them, and my hon. friend himself will, I doubt not, have the kindness to correct me if I am wrong. There were, I think, four points principally put forward. Firstly, that there was a certain franchise which must be considered to be the maximum for counties, and that this was £10; secondly, that there was also a certain franchise which must be considered to be the maximum for boroughs, and that to make this satisfactory it should on no account be above £6; thirdly, he considered that the extension of the franchise ought to be separated from the re-distribution of seats; and fourthly—he will forgive me if I do not quote him with sufficient precision—he thought that separation of the two subjects ought to take place in order that the interval of time between the two might mature and ripen the public mind after the passing of the Franchise Bill, so as to obtain, if a later, yet a more full and conclusive settlement of the question. These, as far as my memory serves me, were the four points of opinion delivered by my hon. friend. And what have we done? We agreed with my hon. friend in one of them—we agreed with him in the policy of the separating the franchise from the re-distribution of seats. And should we not have been the most contemptible of all the poltroons ever misnamed Ministers, if, having that opinion, we had shrunk from acting on it because we might know well enough, without any gift of divination, that the leader, forsooth, of the Tory party would found on that circumstance a charge of subserviency which he himself knows to be thoroughly unfounded just as well as we do? If subserviency exists, why has it not appeared in our conduct with reference to the other opinions of my hon. friend? Why were we to differ with him in everything? Why have we not proposed the £10 franchise recommended by my hon. friend, and by the right hon. gentleman himself in the Bill of 1859? Why have we not proposed the £6 franchise introduced in 1860 under the express sanction of the right hon. gentleman the Member for Calne,<sup>2</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

declared by my hon. friend the Member for Birmingham<sup>1</sup> to be the highest figure that could be allowed to stand in any satisfactory Reform Bill? If this subserviency exists, how is it that these opinions have not been followed? It is true that my hon. friend, with, I think, great moderation and great wisdom, accepts the Bill as it stands, and his acceptance of it is converted into a charge against the Bill itself. Strange position, indeed, if we have arrived at a state of things in which the very fact that my hon. friend gives his support to this Bill—a Bill proposing a far less popular franchise than was recommended by Lord Palmerston, whose political calmness and deliberative temper have been so justly commended in this debate; by Sir George Lewis, and by the right hon. gentleman the Member for Calne<sup>2</sup>—the very fact that the hon. gentleman supports this Bill is to taint and, as it were, to poison the measure itself. Is it credible that there are such extremes of party and personal animosity in this House, and that the very essence of facts and objects is to change its nature from its relations to particular individuals? And are these the encouragements to political moderation which my hon. friend is to receive? Such, Sir, is the state of the facts, so far as we are concerned, with regard to my hon. friend the Member for Birmingham. Yet I must still say one more word about him. I am sorry to have to do that, but I cannot help doing it. I do sincerely think he is a great deal more obliged to hon. gentlemen opposite than he is to us. It is my firm opinion—though it may be erroneous—that the gentlemen who adopt the line of argument which has been adopted by the right hon. gentleman opposite, with regard to what he calls Americanizing the institutions of this country, are doing their utmost, against their will and against their knowledge—for much of what they have been doing for a long period of time has been not only against their will, but likewise against their knowledge—to magnify and increase the influence of my hon. friend the Member for Birmingham; and if my hon. friend be the dangerous man he is supposed to be, and if he nurses in his breast such wicked schemes against the institutions of the country, it is not through Her Majesty's Government, nor through the agency of those who are now thinking and voting with them, that he will ever obtain the means of giving effect to his wicked intentions, but through the line of argument and statement which has been adopted by his and our opponents, and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

which invests him with powers and attributes which not even his abilities, aided as they are by his known integrity, have ever enabled him to obtain.

And now, Sir, I must bestow two minutes on a question touching several expressions of my own. Perhaps my best apology for troubling the House on such a matter will be that they are expressions which have furnished material in the mouths of others for some hours of this debate. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn,<sup>1</sup> in his very clear, very forcible, very argumentative, and I must say, as it seemed to me—though it has been criticized to a contrary effect—by no means uncandid speech, complimented me on my not having used any of those expressions which may perhaps be best and most briefly summed up in a single phrase that will be sufficiently understood by the House—namely, the “flesh and blood” arguments. Now, Sir, I wish that the noble Lord, the right hon. Baronet, and the right hon. gentleman the Member for Calne<sup>2</sup> had a little more considered what really took place with regard to the use of that and of other more or less kindred expressions. The right hon. Member for Calne for I think half an hour, the right hon. Baronet for Hertfordshire<sup>3</sup> for perhaps half an hour more, not having themselves heard me use the phrase which became for them so copious a theme, founded detailed declamation, argument, denunciation, and I know not what, upon an assumption. They assumed, and doubtless they believed I had used the fact, that the working classes are of our own flesh and blood as a reason why the Bill now before the House should be passed. And my right hon. friend the Member for Calne,<sup>2</sup> in a part of his speech which I admit was quite unanswerable, showed that thus to make use of such a consideration would be the greatest imaginable absurdity. Undoubtedly! But then it so happens I never did use any argument of the kind. There are limits to human folly; and neither here nor elsewhere should I have dreamed of so eccentric a proceeding. I used the expression as a reply—nay, I will presume to go one step further and say, if it be not presumptuous to say it—I used it as a reproof to the language of some of the opponents of the Bill. Sir, in my opinion there are times in debate when extraordinary errors are best met by the declaration of elementary truths. When I heard it stated by a gentleman of ability that to touch the question of enfranchising any portion of the working class was domestic revolution, I thought it time to remind him

<sup>1</sup> Lord Stanley.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

<sup>3</sup> Sir E. B. Lytton.

that the performance of the duties of citizenship does give some presumption of the capacity for civil rights, and that the burden of proof, that exclusion from such rights is warrantable or wise or (as it may be) necessary, lies upon those who exclude. That as I think very simple declaration was magnified into revolutionary doctrine, and great service has it once more done to-night to the leader of the Tory party. On the same grounds, when I heard my right hon. friend describing these working men at from £7 to £10, not once only it must now be said, as an invading army, and as something more, as an invading ambush, as a band of enemies, which was to bring ruin and conflagration as the purpose of its mission, into a city all fore-doomed ; and when I heard these opinions and this illustration once and again repeated, I thought it was time to fall back upon elementary truths as the proper antagonists to these extraordinary errors, and to say, these men whom you are denouncing, not by argument and reason, but beyond the bounds of all argument and reason, are your own flesh and blood. And now, Sir, having stated thus much, I must so far notice the speech of the noble Lord<sup>1</sup> who commenced this debate to-night, as emphatically to deny that in any one point or particular—speaking elsewhere, as he said, and, as has been said by others, in the provinces, but as I should say, addressing my own constituents—have I gone in one jot or tittle beyond the statements made by me on the floor of this House. I do not know really whether I am to look to the principles or to the practice of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford<sup>1</sup> as establishing the rule with regard to what is to be done out of the House by its Members in the use of tongue or pen. I am quite willing, however, to say, without further examination of his practice, that I abide by his precepts ; and this I promise him, I will freely submit to any censure he can bestow, and if censure is to be bestowed he is a good hand at it, when on any occasion he can show that I have said elsewhere of Members of this House or of any proceeding in this House, that which I have not said here, or am not ready to say upon this floor, where in my judgment it is that all our battles may best be fought. I have a more agreeable admission to make. What I have said in the nature of platitudes, or of truisms, or of revolutionary maxims—and the condemned dicta have passed under all these designations alternately as might suit the tastes of the different critics has been said with reference to declarations made by persons of the greatest weight in this

<sup>1</sup> Viscount Cranbourne.

House—made, too, amid a tumult and tempest of cheers—and therefore to be taken as setting forth the sentiments not of one but of many. Yet, I am glad and thankful to admit that those cheers and tumult, overpowering as they were, did not represent the universal sentiment on the other side of the House from which they proceeded. The hon. gentleman the Member for South Lincolnshire <sup>1</sup> explained that certain cheers, which had led me to suppose he might be one of those who entertained opinions of the working class, such as I endeavoured to protest against, had been incorrectly interpreted, and really referred to another subject. My hon. and learned friend the Member for Suffolk,<sup>2</sup> although he has not taken part in this debate, spoke in another discussion upon the malt duty the other evening on the merits of the working class in a spirit which proves that he, at least, entertains none of those ungenerous sentiments in regard to them, and that tone, I feel assured, notwithstanding some instances leading to a contrary conclusion, largely pervades the Benches opposite. But I now pass on from the brief explanation which I have given of the particular epithets and expressions used by myself with reference to the sentiments of others, and I think I may appeal to hon. Members to support me when I say that it was not I who first introduced into these discussions observations of this colour and description. It was not in my opening speech that they had their rise, and so long as our debates are conducted in the manner of which the speech of the noble Lord opposite <sup>3</sup> has furnished us with so good an example, I may, I hope, venture to promise that the House will never hear from me any more of such expressions, be they platitudes, be they the truth, or be they fairly characterized as revolutionary and subversive paradoxes.

And now, Sir, I proceed. Now, I come to take a retrospect of this debate. It is natural, it is unavoidable, that my attention should first, and in a principal degree, rest on the remarkable speech which we heard yesterday from my right hon. friend the Member for Calne.<sup>4</sup> With that speech I shall not attempt to deal in detail, and that for many reasons. One of these reasons, perhaps, is a disinclination to measure swords with such a man ("Hear, hear!") That cheer, complimentary as it is, does not at any rate, precede but follows my own admission. A second reason is in my recollection, and a third lies in my hopes with respect to my right hon. friend. I cannot forget—although he

<sup>1</sup> Sir John Trollope.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Stanley.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Fitz-Roy Kelly.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

may—his connexion with the men who sit on these Benches. I cannot forget the services which, as a public man, he has rendered, and while I know of no language strong enough to express the grief—nay, astonishment with which I regard his present extraordinary opinions on the question of Reform, passing, as they seemed to do, beyond those entertained, or at least those avowed by other Members, yet I think the evident framework of his mind, as well as his recent conduct on other questions, entitles him to this admission at the hands of his party—that he is pursuing the dictates of his conscience, and that upon general subjects his judgments are frankly liberal. I only hope that when he is again doing battle in the ranks and for the political objects of those among whom he sits, he may display a little more moderation than he has done in the course of the present struggle. With respect to his speech, I may be permitted to observe upon it in either of two aspects. When I look upon it in the light of a great Parliamentary display; when I consider the force of the weapons which he used, the keenness of their edge, and the skill and rapidity of the hand by which they were wielded, I am lost, indeed I was at the time lost, in admiration, though I was myself the object of a fair proportion of the cuts and thrusts which he delivered. But, Sir, when I take another view of that remarkable discourse; when I think of the end and aim to which it was applied—when I think how shallow, unworthy was the exhibition which he gave us of this great and noble Constitution of England, which I, for one, really thought had struck deep roots into our soil, and was fixed there in a manner to defy the puny efforts of my Lord Russell and his colleagues—when I recollect how my right hon. friend, exaggerating more and more as he went on his fears and apprehensions, and colouring every object more and more highly in the phantom visions he raised up—when I found him travelling back to Australia, his old abode, and on discovering there that the public men of that country had, after all, been prosecuting in his absence the career they commenced under his auspices, and when he ended with this portentous discovery—that what he called anarchy must be arrested in the colonies by the paramount power of Parliamentary interference from this country for the purpose of taking away from our fellow-countrymen at the antipodes the powers of self-government which they enjoy, then I confess that the admiration I had felt was lost and swallowed up—I will not say in shame but in grief. Will my right hon. friend permit me to apply to him the story which is told of

the mother of the Regent Duke of Orleans, Elizabeth the Princess Palatine of Bavaria. She said of her son what I will venture to apply to my right hon. friend. Her story was, that at his birth the fairies were invited to attend. Each came, and each brought the infant the gift of a talent. But in sending the invitations one fairy had unhappily been forgotten. She came unasked, and said for her revenge, "Yes, he shall have all the talents except one, that of knowing how and for what end to apply them."

The argument of my right hon. friend depended entirely on a series of unsound and what I may call enormous assumptions. The first which I shall deal with is the assumption that the Government has insulted the House of Commons. Insult, vilification, degradation, harshness, tyranny, despotism—these are some of the flowers of speech which have been applied in the course of this debate by my noble friend the Member for Haddington,<sup>1</sup> on the part of those whom he called moderate Liberals, and by others to the conduct of the Government. But, to do him justice, my right hon. friend never deals in generalities, so he fastened on a phrase. He thinks he substantiated his charge by saying that I had used these words, "We know with whom we have to deal." The right hon. gentleman says that phrase means the House of Commons; and, consequently, that the House of Commons is insulted. But did it mean the House of Commons? It did not. There is no more common political artifice, as far as my experience goes, than this—when a gentleman finds himself stung or fastened down, or aptly described by some particular phrase or sentiment, he shifts the application of it from himself, and he complains that it has been applied, and, of course, disrespectfully applied to the House of Commons. Sir, I did not apply my phrase to the House of Commons. I will explicitly tell my right hon. friend to whom I did not apply it, and, if it be any satisfaction to him, I will tell him also to whom I did apply it. I did not apply it to my right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University,<sup>2</sup> or to the right hon. gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire,<sup>3</sup> both of whom, as we perfectly well know, are friendly to a reduction of the borough franchise. We may, indeed, have a battle with my right hon. friend (Mr. Walpole) at the proper time, for he declares, although I own myself unable to perceive it, that a principle is involved in the difference between the rates of £10 and £14 as applied to the counties, and between the amounts £7

<sup>1</sup> Lord Elcho.      <sup>2</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.      <sup>3</sup> Mr. J. W. Henley.

and £8 as applied to the boroughs. But he is friendly to the reduction of the franchise in boroughs. He has declared his opinions, and no doubt he will be ready at the proper time to vote in conformity with them. His whole conduct has been open and direct. If I had applied such an expression to him I should have been guilty of the grossest injustice. I had in my mind very different persons. Does my right hon. friend the Member for Calne<sup>1</sup> recollect how, in one of his plays, that prince of comedians, Aristophanes, conveys, through the medium of some character or other, a rebuke to some prevailing tendency or sentiment of the time—I cannot recollect now what it was—too many are the years that have slipped away since I read it—but that character, addressing the audience, says, “But now, my good Athenians, pray recollect I am not speaking of the city, I am not speaking of the public, I am only speaking of certain depraved and crooked little men.” And if I may be permitted to make a metaphorical application of these epithets—confining myself most strictly to the metaphorical use, speaking only in a political sense, and with exclusive reference to this question of Reform, I would say it was not of the House of Commons, but of “certain depraved and crooked little men” that I used these words, and I frankly own now in candour my right hon. friend is, according to my judgment and intention, first and foremost among them. “We know with whom we have to deal,” because we know we have to deal with him. My right hon. friend is opposed to the lowering of the borough franchise. He knows that is the object of this Bill. If I understood his speech aright, and he is so perspicuous that it is hardly possible to be mistaken, he is opposed to Reform in every shape and form; yet, though he is opposed to the measure as a whole, he does not oppose the second reading of the Bill, but has been content to vote for an Amendment which in effect says no more than this, “We think that a bad Bill which is already on the table, but you must lay another bad Bill on the table, and then we will consider it.” I think, therefore, that I am justified in using the words, significant as I admit them to be, “we know with whom we have to deal.” We have to deal with gentlemen who are opposed to the reduction of the franchise, but who do not think proper to express the ground of their opposition by their vote. The course that we have taken is a course taken avowedly upon a principle. We do not deny, we do not dispute, that we are contending for the reduction of the franchise.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

We are not now contending for a particular amount. We may mean to propose, and we may mean to adhere to a particular amount ; but what we are now contending for is a reduction of the franchise. But we are opposed by open antagonists, and we are also opposed by concealed antagonists. We wish to strip away the disguise from the latter class of antagonists. We wish that they should speak audibly, and in the face of day that which they think, that which they mean, and no effort, Sir, on our part, no amount of endurance, no amount of labour than we can give, shall be wanting to attain that object, and to take care that the people of England, as well as we, the Government, shall know with whom we have to deal.

Then the second head of my right hon. friend's indictment against us as to insulting this House was that after we had produced a certain quantity of statistics, we declared it should not, with our good will, have any more. Sir, I never said anything of the kind. What I said was, that when questions respecting the social anatomy of class, and the conditions and the numbers in particular of the working class reached a point, which, I say frankly, appeared to me to threaten to assume an invidious and offensive character—I mean justly offensive to them—what I did say was that it was time such inquiries should stop, and that as far as the Government was concerned, we would be no party to their being carried to that point. As to further statistics, Members know the reverse ; for example, the hon. Member for Northamptonshire knows well that on the very same night when this matter was under discussion, the Government made not the smallest objection to the production of the statistics which he desired.

But my right hon. friend says—and I think this was the third proof he gave that we were insulting the House—he says that the information on the subject of the redistribution of seats, that is, the measure which we intend to propose on that subject, is kept back out of mere wantonness. And the task he commends to me is this—I have to show, he conceives, that that measure is so entirely detached from the considerations applicable to the second reading of our present Bill, that it ought upon no account to be given to the House before such second reading, and yet that it is so intimately intertwined with the considerations applicable to the Motion for going into Committee that it must of necessity be given to the House before it is about to go into Committee. Sir, I am bound to prove, and I shall prove no such thing. It is

not we who have ever held that the measure for re-distribution was so intertwined with the second reading of this Bill that it must necessarily be given before we could go into Committee. On the contrary, Sir, we have frankly declared, knowing, as I said before, with whom we have to deal, that the great apprehension which possessed us was not one merely respecting the course that would on that night be taken by the representatives of the small boroughs, naturally and not unwarrantably alarmed on behalf of their constituents. That is a comparatively small matter. But our main dread was that the covert enemies of the reduction of the franchise would make use of that whole wilderness of multitudinous particulars which belongs to the subject, a re-distribution of seats, to perplex and entangle the whole question so as to render progress with it virtually impracticable within the time likely to be at our command. That was the fear we entertained. But as time went on we found that many differed from us as to our mode of procedure, with respect to whom it would have been insolence on our part to doubt that they at the same time concurred with us in a common object—namely, in desiring a reduction of the franchise. Without the smallest reserve, therefore, and in deference to those wishes, we departed from the method of action which our own judgment recommended, and we incurred what we thought real hazard and inconvenience as far as the progress of the measure is concerned. We have, however, adhered all along to the opinion we originally expressed—that the safest course, could we have persuaded the House to pursue it, would have been a complete separation for the moment of the two subjects. I say for the moment, because I am now reminded that I omitted to notice, I believe at the proper time, one point in regard to the opinions of the hon. Member for Birmingham.<sup>1</sup> That particular opinion of my hon. friend that the re-distribution of seats was a question to be reserved with a view to an intermediate ripening of the public mind on the subject was an opinion that we have never entertained. It was an opinion that my right hon. friend might entertain with perfect honour; but for us—who had formerly combined the two subjects, and for those who now professed to disunite them exclusively upon grounds of convenience and advantage in point of procedure—for us to entertain such a latent purpose would have been a base device, would have been conduct unworthy either of a Government or of any gentleman or any reputable man in whatever capacity or

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.

station. And I must confess it is with pain that I can with difficulty allow myself to believe that any such opinion can have been entertained of the Government by any gentleman who numbers himself among its supporters. I cannot complain or wonder at its being described to us by gentlemen opposite, for the distinction which the hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon has made between personal and political honour is a distinction which has been at least conventionally established to a sufficient degree to warrant charges of that kind ; but I must say that for gentlemen who have general confidence in the Government, to think the Government capable of any such act is a thing I am at a loss to understand, and the advice I would respectfully presume to give them is, that they withdraw that general confidence immediately, and make it their first business not to carry an indirect Motion like the Amendment now under consideration, but to put the Government out of office by the most direct and summary means they can discover. Thus much, Sir, as to insulting the House by withholding information.

And now, Sir, I hope I may say a few words as to the general charge of an attempt to domineer or tyrannize over this House. The right hon. gentleman opposite has given me a favourable opportunity of explaining my position to the Liberal party on that subject. If, Sir, I had been the man who at the very outset of his career, well-nigh half a century ago, had with an almost prophetic foresight fastened upon two great groups of questions—the great historic questions of the day, of which the right hon. gentleman opposite, from the last portion of his speech, seems never to have heard ; I mean the questions relating to the removal of civil disabilities for religious opinions, and to Parliamentary Reform—if I had been the man who, halting thus in early youth, in the first stage of his political career, fixed upon those questions and made them his own, then went on and prosecuted them with sure and unflagging instinct until the triumph in both cases was achieved ; if I had been the man whose name has been associated for forty years, and often in the very first place of eminence, with every measure of beneficent legislation—in other words, had I been Earl Russell, there might have been, some temptation to pass into excess in the exercise of authority, and to apply a pressure to this House in itself unjustifiable. But Sir, I am not Earl Russell. The right hon. gentleman, secure I suppose in the recollection of his own constituency, has taunted me with the political errors of my boyhood. The right hon.

gentleman when he addressed the hon. Member for Westminster, took occasion to show his magnanimity, for he declared that he would not take the philosopher to task for what he wrote twenty-five years ago. But when he caught one who thirty-five years ago, who, just emerged from boyhood, and still an undergraduate at Oxford, had expressed an opinion adverse to the Reform Bill of 1832, of which he had so long and bitterly repented, then the right hon. gentleman could not resist the temptation that offered itself to his appetite for effect. He, a Parliamentary champion of twenty years' standing, and the leader, as he informs us to-night, of the Tory party, is so ignorant of the House of Commons, or so simple in the structure of his mind, that he positively thought he would obtain a Parliamentary advantage by exhibiting me to the public view for reprobation as an opponent of the Reform Bill of 1852. Sir, as the right hon. gentleman has done me the honour thus to exhibit me, let me for a moment trespass on the patience of the House to exhibit myself. What he has stated is true. I deeply regret it. But I was bred under the shadow of the great name of Canning; every influence connected with that name governed the first political impressions of my childhood and my youth; with Mr. Canning I rejoiced in the removal of religious disabilities from the Roman Catholic body, and in the free and truly British tone which he gave to our policy abroad; with Mr. Canning I rejoiced in the opening he made towards the establishment of free commercial interchanges between nations; with Mr. Canning and under the shadow of that great name, and under the shadow of the yet more venerable name of Burke, I grant my youthful mind and imagination were impressed with the same idle and futile fears which still bewilder and distract the mature mind of the right hon. gentleman. I had conceived that very same fear, that ungovernable alarm at the first Reform Bill in the days of my undergraduate career at Oxford which the right hon. gentleman now feels; and the only difference between us is this—I thank him for bringing it into view by his quotation—that, having those views, I, as it would appear, moved the Oxford Union Debating Society to express them clearly, plainly, forcibly, in downright English, while the right hon. gentleman does not dare to tell the nation what it is that he really thinks, and is content to skulk under the shelter of the meaningless Amendment which is proposed by the noble Lord. And now, Sir, I quit the right hon. gentleman; I leave him to his reflections, and I envy him not

one particle of the polemical advantage which he has gained by his discreet reference to the proceedings of the Oxford Union Debating Society in the year of grace 1831.

My position then, Sir, in regard to the Liberal party is in all points the opposite of Earl Russell's. Earl Russell might have been misled possibly, had he been in this place, into using language which would have been unfit coming from another person. But it could not be the same with me. I am too well aware of the relations which subsist between the party and myself. I have none of the claims he possessed. I came among you an outcast from those with whom I associated, driven from them, I admit, by no arbitrary act, but by the slow and resistless forces of conviction. I came among you, to make use of the legal phraseology, in *pauperis formâ*. I had nothing to offer you but faithful and honourable service. You received me, as Dido received the shipwrecked Æneas—

“ Ejectum littore egentem  
Accepi—

And I only trust you may not hereafter at any time have to complete the sentence in regard to me—

“ Et regni demens in parte locavi.”

You received me with kindness, indulgence, generosity, and I may even say with some measure of confidence. And the relation between us has assumed such a form that you never can be my debtors, but that I must for ever be in your debt. It is not for me, under such circumstances, that any word will proceed that can savour of the character which the right hon. gentleman imputes to the conduct of the Government with respect to the present Bill. Now, Sir, let me state what I take to be the actual condition of the question that is to be decided to-night. For this is not only a protracted debate—it is not only one upon which the House of Commons has freely lavished from every one of its quarters or its sections the choicest treasures of its wit, its argument, its rhetorical and its persuasive powers—it is also an historical debate. We are now about the process what is called “making history.” We are now laying the foundations of much that is to come. This occasion is a starting point from which I presume to think the career we have to run as individuals and parties will in many respects take its character and colour. Now, Sir, the main charge brought against us is this—that we have

introduced a Franchise Bill alone. Is that, then, a very grave offence? There were two reasons that might surely, without reproach, have moved us to take such a course. One was the reason of policy—the desire to avoid inviting unnecessarily an independent combination of persons, and causing them to join on different grounds for the common and momentary purpose of rejecting the Bill. If we were influenced by that motive, I do not know in confessing the fact we need in any way be ashamed of it. But the conclusive reason which swayed us was that which I mentioned in introducing the Bill—the feeling that the passing of a combined Bill must be regarded as impossible, that under the circumstances which then existed it was not possible for us to ask the House to continue its sittings through the autumn, that the time which we must reckon as likely to be consumed in debate upon the double measure would be more than we could make sure, within the ordinary limits of the Session, we should be able to devote to it, and that, consequently, if we introduced a measure which we knew could not in the ordinary course of things pass the House in the time available for its discussion—not only would there be another failure to be added to the already long list of failures, but one attended on our part with great dishonour. We should have met with all and more than all the opposition which has encountered us, although not, perhaps, from the same quarters. And we should have had to boot the reproach from within, that we had adopted an indirect method of proceeding, and had claimed credit for being the friends of Reform, while we had laid upon the table a measure which we ourselves knew it was impossible to dispose of. This second and conclusive reason was, then, the question of time. It was the twelve-day or twenty-four day argument which has attained such considerable celebrity, and on which my mind dwells with peculiar satisfaction, because it seems to have been the only point of all those mooted in this debate on which everybody has been agreed. No one, at least, has challenged it. That argument of time was also for us, under the circumstances, an argument of honour; and the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn<sup>1</sup> owned that the alternative to our method of proceeding was the postponement of the whole question to next Session. Now, after what has passed let the noble Lord place himself in our position. I ask the noble Lord, for I have confidence in his fairness, to place himself in our position. We were the authors, most of us, of measures which had

<sup>1</sup> Lord Stanley.

resulted in two or three former failures. We had taken part, most of us, in the strong and decisive measure which resulted in the ejection of the Government of Lord Derby upon a Bill relating to this very same subject. We had postponed for several years after that resolution the resumption of the subject which was dropped in 1860. We found upon inquiry last autumn that we could obtain in time to legislate all the information which appeared to us to be needed in order to enable Parliament to deal with the franchise. Was it, then, so great an offence, one which deserved to be visited with such severity, that we thought it more honourable to ourselves and more honourable to our party to do at once that which we found we could do at once, and to postpone to a later stage that which absolutely required to be postponed? Was it so strange a thing that after four Reform Bills had failed, and failed egregiously, we should think of varying their form, of removing some of the cargo from the ship? Was not that, indeed, the natural course to pursue when it had been found impossible to navigate her with the whole of it aboard?

And again, Sir, had the House of Commons evinced a deliberate determination on former occasions only to deal with the extension of the franchise and the re-distribution of seats as one measure the case would have been different. But no such determination had been announced, nor can any such opinion be found upon the records or inferred from the acts of the House. In the many debates which have taken place upon the Bill, with respect to the county franchise, introduced by the hon. Member for West Surrey,<sup>1</sup> it was never urged that that measure must of necessity be combined with a proposal for the re-distribution of seats, nor have suggestions of this kind been ordinarily made, if my memory serves me right, in the debates which have taken place upon the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Leeds<sup>2</sup> to effect a reduction of the borough franchise. Again, Sir, is not Ireland a case eminently in point? Does not Ireland present to us the smallest borough constituencies in the Kingdom? And yet we proceeded without scruple in the case of Ireland in the very same manner we have adopted. We added 100,000 or 150,000, or, as I have seen it stated, a yet larger number of voters to the constituencies of Ireland, and still we have never touched the question of re-distribution at all. And yet, because we have adopted a similar course, our conduct is regarded as something monstrous, and as justifying every kind of strange and dishonouring suspicion.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. G. Cubitt.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. E. Baines.

And now, Sir, I will turn to another head of evidence. Let us see what hon. gentlemen say when they go to their constituents. That is a description of evidence to which, in my opinion, much weight should be attached, because the sentiments of hon. gentlemen on such occasions are dictated not only by reason, but by instinct—by that instinct which as an inward monitor teaches them what to say when they go before the arbiters of their fate. I have been rather curious in examining the addresses of hon. gentlemen, and I find that there were 117 borough Members who entered into particulars on the subject of Reform, and did not refer to it simply on general terms. Out of these, no more than sixteen referred to the question of re-distribution of seats ; and I believe that every one of those sixteen members who have testified in this unequivocal manner to their belief in the importance of re-distribution of seats, is going to vote with the Government in favour of the present Bill. The remaining 101 declared themselves at the election upon the franchise alone. Whether some of them may since have become conscious of the great importance of the re-distribution of seats I do not know ; but on referring to the names, I find that the vast majority of those who think the subject of Reform is worth introducing at all refer to it in making their profession of a political creed, simply in connexion with and for its most important branch—the extension of the franchise. Therefore, Sir, I must say I do not think it can be shown that any great reproach attaches to the Government for the course which it has adopted.

Now, Sir, I come to the language that has been held about the inconvenience of the separation. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Stanley) has argued this point of the question very high. I do not blame the noble Lord for what I certainly thought a strain of great exaggeration. I will only say this, I doubt whether it was altogether consistent in the speaker of the speech. For what was the noble Lord's course in 1859 ? The noble Lord objects to anything lying in prospect only ; he wants to have everything in hand. Is that so ? There are two heads under which this objection arises ; one is with respect to boundaries, and the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) has shown to-night that is much the greater of the two in his opinion. The other has references to the re-distribution of seats. How did the noble Lord stand with respect to the question of boundaries ? Though the Government of which he was a Member had been twelve months in office when they brought in their Bill, though they had

ample time for ascertaining all the facts, and for proposing an exact system of delimitation to Parliament, they made no such proposal—all they did was to insert a clause directing that inquiries should be made, which inquiries were to be made after the Bill should have passed, and to be followed by a Bill for fixing boundaries. So that as to this head the noble Lord did the very thing which he charges us with doing. And what did he do with respect to re-distribution? He put in fifteen seats in his Bill; it was not much, but it was the best part of the measure; the other provisions of the Bill of 1859 were such as I would rather not now describe. Well, the noble Lord put in fifteen seats, and having thus satisfied himself, he also proposed to fix a certain rate for the borough and county franchise, and then said, "Though we give you only fifteen seats now, it is because we cannot do more at present; but if you look at the borough and county franchise, you will see that as they are now to be identified by-and-by you can re-distribute seats as much as you like." Thus, having by the Bill thrown the entire question of boundaries bodily into the future, and having left the question of re-distribution, in a great measure, to stand out for its real settlement at some time perfectly undetermined, the noble Lord now comes down and delivers this admirable speech—admirable except for the speaker—on the intolerable inconvenience of making any separation at all, between the question of the franchise and the determination of the constituencies among which the seats are to be divided. And now, Sir, I wish to say one word on an illustration used by the noble Lord. Not the figure of the House, for that was well answered by my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General for Scotland,<sup>1</sup> who reminded him that we were not going to build a house, for we have got a very good one. But I refer to the illustration which the noble Lord drew from the subject of finance. "But," said the noble Lord, "in finance you would never do this, for in finance the House always has the whole scheme before it." But does the noble Lord forget that controversy of historic fame which closed about four or five years ago, when, for the special purpose of the protection of its privileges, the House thought fit to unite all its taxes and all its chief financial measures for the year in one Bill? Until that year the practice had been to pass all the financial proposals as independent Bills, subject to all the risks which the noble Lord described, and all the dangers and inconveniences which he conjured up, and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. George Young.

presented to our view as attendant upon severances of this kind. But who were the defenders of that separate legislation? Why, all its defenders came from behind the noble Lord; they were the very same men who to-night I suppose will crowd one of the lobbies of the House to sustain a vote in flat contrariety to the rule laid down by the noble Lord.

My right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge<sup>1</sup> made what I must frankly call a commendable and in intention a helpful suggestion. Why do not you proceed by Resolution? he asked. I thank him for it, because I am certain of the spirit in which that suggestion was offered. But had my right hon. friend thought of the meaning of proceeding by Resolution? We could easily conceive, I think, how our first Resolution would be framed; it might be very short, for it would not require much explanation. It would be easy to put into a few Resolutions so much of the Bill as related to the franchise; but I want to know how he would have put the re-distribution of seats into the form of a Resolution? Would he have a Resolution declaring that it is expedient to take away so many Members from thirty or forty boroughs; and would he name those boroughs? If he did not name them the Resolution would be meaningless; and if he did name them, what, I ask, would be the difference between the Resolution and a Bill for re-distribution, so far as regards the main point in issue—namely, the gaining time by avoiding multiplied topics of debate. Nothing would be gained by that course. I fully appreciate the suggestion, but I am bound to say I do not think we have incurred an evil result or deserved any blame for not adopting it.

Now, Sir, what is the real state of the case with regard to distribution? This is very much at the root of our present difficulty. My hon. friend the Member for Birmingham<sup>2</sup> has said truly that it is conceivable that you may have a scheme of re-distribution such as altogether to frustrate and to intercept the effect of your reduction of the franchise. If we were to introduce a scheme of that kind I admit that everything that has been said against us would be just. But, Sir, we are not persons who have given no indication in former times of our views of re-distribution. My belief is that re-distribution, though an exceedingly important subject, is secondary altogether to the franchise, because it is limited by and regulated upon principles which I think afford little room for difference of opinion among fair-minded

<sup>1</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. John Bright.

and moderate men. The re-distributions of the Bill of 1854, of the Bill of 1859, and of the Bill of 1860 have proceeded upon one and the same set of principles—namely to abridge the representation in one portion of our system, by taking Members from the boroughs of small populations, and to give the seats thus obtained in such proportion as might be thought fair between the new towns and such of the counties and large towns already represented as might appear to have just claims to an increase of representation. Such are the principles; but of course there must be some variety in the mode of applying them. In that view of the subject I think any reasonable man will see that there is nothing at all that can vitally affect in any manner a Bill which extends the franchise. The Bill, I think, of the right hon. gentleman and Lord Derby proposed to enfranchise seven towns. Birkenhead has since been enfranchised; but six of those boroughs still remain, and their population averages 20,000, so that altogether the population numbers 120,000. Take 120,000 people out of the counties; what is the number of £7 voters which would by such a measure be brought into existence? It is not worth considering for a moment. The right hon. gentleman did, indeed, I think, state that there were 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 of people in the counties that might properly be withdrawn from them and included within the towns. I grant that if you approach the subject of re-distribution with the intention of what is commonly called “cooking the constituency,” you will, by seeking to destroy the effects of the reduction of the franchise by the re-distribution of seats, make re-distribution a most dangerous engine. We disclaim all such intentions. I think our former conduct ought to acquit us of any such intentions. But if such intentions be imputed to us, it ought to be by our enemies, for such intentions are not to be imputed compatibly with political friendship. We consider it to be the proper purpose of re-distribution by moderate and reasonable changes to second the provisions of the law touching the franchise, not covertly to neutralize and overturn them. Now, Sir, we have been asked to do some things, and we have done them. But let us just consider what they are and what they are not. It has been stated, and stated assiduously, that we have said that re-distribution must be postponed for another year, and that nothing could be done on that subject until the Franchise Bill became law. We have said neither one nor the other. We have never refused any request or suggestion to proceed with re-distribution during the

present year. We said that we should not proceed with the plan of re-distribution until in our judgment the fate of the Franchise Bill had been secured. But that is a very different thing. That security may become apparent at different stages of the progress, according as circumstances happen, which can only be judged of at the moment. But as to the postponement of the Re-distribution Bill for another year, we have not said anything of the sort. I myself, in the name of the Government, distinctly pointed out that if it were the pleasure of the House, in its anxiety for a prompt settlement of the whole subject of Reform, to prolong its sittings during the autumn the Government would not be the parties to object. But, strange to say, although that offer was intelligibly given, not a single one of the gentlemen who are so keen for considering re-distribution with the question of the franchise has let fall a syllable showing a disposition to agree to that proposal. We said that in our opinion the re-distribution of seats formed an essential part of Reform; we said the political engagement on which we stake our existence as a Government is not confined to the Franchise Bill, but extends to the subject of re-distribution; and we said the process of re-distribution, if there were a mind to undertake it with despatch, should not be interrupted by any tardiness or laziness of ours. We are taunted, and not altogether unjustly, by the right hon. gentleman opposite with having changed our front, because we have made this further concession in order to meet the views of gentlemen whom we believe to be united with ourselves in the object that we have in view—that we will lay the Bill for the re-distribution of seats upon the table before asking the House to go into Committee upon the Bill relating to the franchise. And now, Sir, I may fairly ask, what more is desired? Let us hear what is asked, that we may consider, whether, compatibly with the main design we have in view, we can give our assent to the demand? The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn <sup>1</sup> says, "Give us a guarantee that if the Franchise Bill passes, the Re-distribution Bill shall also pass." Is the noble Lord so much afraid of the consequences of failure as to forget that if our plan of re-distribution fails the Government must fail with it, and consequently that if he is so keen for re-distribution, that he can come in himself and carry his own. The noble Lord is afraid of a dissolution. But there can, I think, be nothing more obvious than this, that the Government having produced

<sup>1</sup> Lord Stanley.

these two Bills will have every conceivable motive of a selfish kind for avoiding a dissolution until both the one and the other shall have passed. We shall have conciliated a few, while—proceed as cautiously as we may—we shall have offended many. If you think we may have some favour and interest with the constituencies likely to be franchised, it is in your power to gain as great an interest in them, should you but have the wisdom and forethought to desist from the course that you are now pursuing, and to show a little less mistrust of them—that portion of your fellow-countrymen—should you for example henceforward refrain from insisting that to allow them to possess the franchise is to Americanize our institutions.

I wish to be clearly understood upon the question connected with the form and manner of proceeding with the measure, especially after it has been repeatedly stated in debate that there are various rumours circulating in the House. I believe there are gentlemen who desire of us more than we have promised to do, who are not satisfied with our having said that the Re-distribution Bill should be placed in their possession immediately after the second reading of the measure that is now before them. Let me endeavour, then, to be clear upon this subject. Our object is to draw a separation broadly and unequivocally between those who really desire a reduction of the franchise in counties, and above all, in boroughs, and those who do not; but who are apparently disposed to make use of the question of the re-distribution of seats, and of every other topic, for the purpose of concealing their hostility and yet effectively prosecuting their opposition to the reduction of the franchise. Now, Sir, I have to say that the Government will be loth to quarrel upon any mere question of procedure with any gentleman in whom we recognize a community of object and purpose with ourselves. If gentlemen have the same end in view, we shall have every disposition as far as we can contrive it, to adopt the same means. We hold every subject of procedure to be wholly secondary to the purpose for which it is intended. What we cannot do, however, is this—we cannot undertake to abandon the ground we have gained, for, in my opinion, we have gained ground. We will not undertake to forego the fruit of the labours which the House has bestowed on that part of the Session which is past; and we cannot undertake to waste that portion of the Session which is yet to come. We will not, as far as depends upon us, either encourage or endure procrastination. I must in the plainest manner convey to my noble

friend the Member for Chester<sup>1</sup> that we will be no parties to procrastination ; and no concealment shall subsist if we have the power to pierce it, and to unveil to the public whatever is beneath. That, Sir, is the state of the case with regard to our intentions upon what may happen after the second reading of this Bill. Now, Sir, in a great question like this, it is well understood what is really involved in the second reading. Let it be clearly understood that we are not now debating the rejection or acceptance of clauses secondary with reference to the main purpose of the Bill. It is no question of savings banks, it is no question of dockyard enfranchisement ; nor is it even a question concerning the votes of leaseholders in counties. And here I will, in passing, make an admission to my right hon. friend the Member for North Staffordshire. He has certainly surprised me by the number of votes which he states would be added to the register of a particular division of a county under the operation of this clause. I do not know that his estimate is precisely correct ; I may have occasion to question it. We have proposed the clause I am referring to under the belief that, as a general and almost universal rule, the number of those leaseholding votes are comparatively few. If that be not so, it is a question undoubtedly open to re-consideration.

Nor, of course, are we at this moment asking of any gentleman to pledge himself as to the particular figure at which he will fix the reduced franchise in counties, nor even in boroughs. We do not conceal our intentions. We do not hold out the smallest expectation that we shall deviate from our position in this respect ; we cannot depart from it. But that is not the point to be decided to-night. The point we are to decide to-night is whether the House will, by a majority, vote for the second reading of this Bill—that is to say, for a measure affirming the reduction of the franchise in counties and especially in towns. That is the question. (“ No, no ! ” *and Cheers.*) It may not be the question in the estimation of the hon. gentleman ; but it seems not improper that those who move the second reading of a Bill should at any rate put the House in possession of what they know to be the intention of the movers, and what they believe to be, and so far as depends on them intend should be, the true significance of the vote for which they ask. Have we, then, good reason for asking that this Bill should be read a second time in lieu of adopting the Motion of the noble Earl ? I think we have very sound reasons for

<sup>1</sup> Lord Grosvenor.

asking it. They are these. We gave notice that we would introduce a measure of Reform, and we produced the Bill. We were saluted by my noble friend with a hostile Motion, and a Motion framed in concert with the party in Opposition. ("No, no!" and "Hear, hear!") On a former occasion I endeavoured to do justice to the moderation of my noble friend's character. I wish now to bear testimony to the moderation and mildness of his language. But the moderation and mildness of his language cannot blind the Government to the severity of his act. He spoke of his being a follower of Earl Russell, but the Amendment coming from my noble friend has been concerted with the party opposite. (An HON. MEMBER: I do not believe it was.) (*Much laughier.*) I am bound to say that I am unable to recognize the hon. Member as the leader of the party opposite. I recognize the right hon. gentleman the Member for Bucks<sup>1</sup> as filling that position, and no one else. But, returning to the Amendment; I am not aware of any case, within our Parliamentary experience, or of any case whatever, in which a Government has consented to accept such an Amendment, so prepared and so produced. I frankly own that if I were to be dragged at the chariot-wheels of any man, I would be as willing to be dragged at the chariot-wheels of my noble friend as at those of any one whom I have the honour to know. But that is a process to which a Government cannot and must not submit. I marked the words of my noble friend, looking back at his conduct in 1859. He was then so zealous for a reduction of the borough franchise, that he would not hear of the proposal to read the Bill of that day a second time, because it did not propose such reduction. My noble friend now repents of that refusal. He says it was a very unwise proceeding. He holds that, having then before them a Government which had introduced a Reform Bill, and which were pledged to stand or fall by it, to stop the Government in its career was not the way to promote the cause of Reform. But, strange inconsistency of human nature—not peculiar to my noble friend, but only too common in the annals of casuistry! For a moment, and with evident sincerity, he repents; but at the same moment the temptation again presents itself, and again he falls. In the very act of making the confession he repeats and revives the offence. My noble friend now in truth asks the House to do over again what he laments that it did in 1859. We ask that our Bill may be read a second time. Is our request an unfair one? My

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

right hon. friend the Member for Calne <sup>1</sup> quoted yesterday, and with great effect, a phrase which has been used by Mr. Hallam. Mr. Hallam says very truly that Ministers have a double allegiance—an allegiance to the Crown, and an allegiance to this House. It is their business, in submitting their measures to the judgment of the House, to consider what their own honour requires; but it is also their duty in deciding as best they can what is expedient for the public interests to consider what may be required for the honour, dignity, and efficiency of the House. Well, Sir, after all that has happened—after the many Bills which have been brought in—after the many unforeseen obstacles ending in miscarriage—after the equivocal and questionable proceedings that have at times been taken with reference to these measures, and the jealousies and reproaches which the public do not understand, but of which they see the effect in the total stoppage of the movement of Reform—we have deliberately thought we were entitled, nay that we were bound, to ask the House for an answer on the question of the reduction of the franchise in counties and boroughs—a question which cannot be affected in its substance by any course which we can pursue with regard to the re-distribution of seats. That is what we have thought, and I think I may ask my noble friend whether we are not perfectly entitled to ask for that answer.

Sir, there was a wish expressed by one of the heroes of that ancient war to which my right hon. friend and myself have so often referred, a wish eminently suitable to the present position of Her Majesty's Government. It is this—

“Let us die in the daylight.”

Now, I ask it of my noble friend that we may die in the daylight. My noble friend's hostility to this Bill—and the fact of such hostility is notorious, for it was declared in his address to his constituents—is not founded upon the circumstance of its not containing clauses for re-distribution, but on the fact of its being a Bill for the reduction of the franchise in boroughs. My noble friend differs vitally from the Government on that subject. I do not complain of that difference of opinion. On the contrary, I honour him for acting according to his own opinion; but I do not think it too much to ask that he should state it in plain words. He asks, however, for a Re-distribution Bill with the Franchise Bill. But suppose a Re-distribution Bill of an objectionable character were introduced, would my noble friend then support

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

the Franchise Bill? I think that is a fair challenge. I think that upon the answer to that challenge, or upon the non-answer to it, which will mean pretty much the same thing, the judgment of the House and of the country may very well be taken.

The right hon. gentleman the Member for Calne<sup>1</sup> has said that we have given no reasons for our Bill; and he likewise said that we know nothing of those 204,000 persons, whom it is proposed to enfranchise in boroughs; indeed, as I think, he repeated the assertion several times. What, Sir, do we know nothing of those 204,000? Does my right hon. friend know nothing of them? We were taught to think he knew a good deal about them. We have not yet wholly forgotten his own significant words so loudly cheered: "we know what sort of men live in these houses." My right hon. friend will recollect the words well enough. They were used in his first speech. They formed part of his declamatory denunciation against the admission of any class below the £10 voters to the franchise. Nor was this all. Who were these Hyperboreans of the speech of my right hon. friend? And what was the wind that got colder as the traveller went further north? Was not the comparison this—that as on the earth's surface the cold increases as we move in that direction, so in the downward figures of the franchise the voters became progressively more drunken, or more venal, or, to refrain from recalling those words, I would say simply more and more unfit? Now, Sir, we too know something of those men, but what we know is very different from the supposed knowledge of my right hon. friend. The right hon. gentleman asked, "Do you think the franchise is good in itself, or do you wish to improve the institutions of the country?" Sir, I find here no dilemma. My answer is, we want to do both. The extension of the franchise within safe and proper limits is good. It will array more persons in support of the institutions of the country, and that is another good. The composition and the working of this House is admirable, and its performances have long since placed it at the head of all the legislative assemblies of the world. It does not follow, however, that it cannot be improved. I will not say with my right hon. friend that it is perfect. I am not sure, indeed, that he said so, but he seemed to mean if not to say it. I am not prepared to pay the worship of idolatry even to this House. I will mention a point in which I think it might be improved. It is this. I need not say I am scarcely speaking of the present House, which has but just entered

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

upon its labours. I am speaking of the reformed Parliament in general. There is a saying which has been ascribed to a very eminent person, still alive—whose name I will not mention because I have no means of knowing whether it has been truly ascribed to him or not, but I will quote it for its own sake. It is to the effect that the unreformed Parliament used to job for individuals, while the reformed Parliament jobs for classes. I do not adopt the rudeness of the phrase, but the substance of the observation is in my opinion just. I think that the influence of separate classes is too strong, and that the influence of the public interest properly so called, as distinguished from the interest of sets, groups, and classes of men, is too weak. I fully admit I am not perhaps altogether an impartial judge; I speak much from my own experience during a lengthened period as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and as in a special degree and sense the guardian of the public purse. Undoubtedly, if there be a weak point in the composition of the House this is the department in which it would most readily and most clearly show itself. I believe that the composition of the House might be greatly improved; and that the increased representation of the working classes would supply us more largely with that description of Members whom we want, who would look not to the interests of classes, but to the public interest. In presuming to say so much as this, I hope I do not convey any reproach to any party or person; but my right hon. friend<sup>1</sup> challenged us so sharply, as if we admitted that no improvement whatever was possible, that I felt bound to state my belief.

Again, Sir, I return to the broad proposition of my right hon. friend. He says we have no reasons. Perhaps he does not admit as a reason what was stated the other day by the hon. Member for Birmingham,<sup>2</sup> that there have been a hundred meetings—public meetings held in favour of this Bill. I observed, when those words were spoken, that loud murmurs arose on the other side of the House at the mention of the number, and I have not the least doubt of their good faith. I, however, was persuaded that the hon. Member for Birmingham was right, and turning to the Report of the Committee on Public Petitions, I counted the meetings. (An Opposition MEMBER: Got up!) The meetings are “got up!” are they? Then you have your remedy. Do you get up meetings against the measure? It will then be seen whether it is or is not an easy matter to get an

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. John Bright.

expression of public sentiment on which to found your operations. I know not whether they are "got up" or not; if gentlemen think they are, it is open to them who think so to try the experiment the other way. But this I know, that I counted the petitions presented from public meetings, and signed by the chairmen of these meetings individually, and I found that between the 11th and the 17th of April there were 187 such petitions, besides 500,000 or 600,000 signatures from individuals in favour of this Bill. So much then, Sir, I say as respects that description of argument which may with fairness be drawn within certain bounds, from the evident and expressed opinion of the country.

But now I have to grapple with the principal argument, if such it be, of my right hon. friend the Member for Calne,<sup>1</sup> and to confront all the dismal pictures he draws of the destruction of the British Constitution. My answer is, that it is not going to be destroyed. We are not going to import American principles. It is not an American principle to reduce the borough franchise. It is a return to old English principles—it is a restoration of the state and course of things that subsisted before, and ought to subsist again. What has happened since 1832? I am now going to state a part of the case on the authority of the right hon. gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire<sup>2</sup>—

"The working people have been having a less and less share in the representation. They had a considerable representation before 1832, through the scot-and-lot voters and freemen. I am not going to say anything either for or against the freemen; but through them the working class had their voice in the representation. They are gradually dying out."—(3 Hansard, clii. 1066.)

That was the emphatic statement of the right hon. gentleman in 1859; and has it been counteracted since? No; it has not been counteracted, not even, as I believe, in the least degree, certainly not to any considerable extent. I will now state the growth of electors in boroughs, and not generally since 1832; for when I stated what it had been from 1832 to 1865, I gave an unjust advantage to my opponents—but since 1851. Now, I pray the House to observe these figures which I am about to give. In 1851 the total number of the electors in boroughs was 410,000; in 1865–6 it was 509,000, showing an increase of 99,000; that is to say, an increase of 24 per cent. in fourteen years. That, then, has been the increase in the number of the electors. I come next to the increase of population in boroughs. In the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. J. W. Henley.

year 1851 it was 7,186,000 ; in 1866 it was 9,266,000, giving an increase of 2,080,000, or, in other words, of 28·9 per cent. in the population. That being so, I ask those gentlemen who speak of the gradual absorption of the working classes into the constituencies and the franchise as being within their reach, to consider these figures. We now see that we have actually a slower growth of the electors in boroughs than of the population. Well, but while the population and the electors have been moving on as I have described, the wealth of the country among the middle and upper classes has, according to the best estimate which I can make, been advancing as follows :—The income tax in 1851, making due allowance for the changes which have been since introduced into the law, may be taken with sufficient approach to accuracy, for the purpose of comparison, as having been worth £850,000 per penny ; this year I am enabled to state that it is worth £1,400,000 per penny ; that is to say, there has been an increase of 65 per cent. in the wealth of the country liable to income tax, or at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum. But when I tell you that this vast increase of wealth has been going on almost entirely in the upper and middle classes, and yet that the total number of electors in the towns does not keep pace with the population, I hope we shall hear no more of this supposed absorption of the working classes into the enfranchised body. I am justified, then, in stating that the working classes are not adequately represented in this House. They are not, it is admitted, represented in any proportion to their numbers ; and without holding that it would be fit for us to do more than lessen the disproportion, we contend it is right to do as much. They are not represented, as I have previously shown, in accordance with their share of the income of the country. Especially after the events of the last few years, I may boldly proceed to say they are not represented in proportion to their intelligence, their virtue, or their loyalty. Finally, they are less represented now than they were thirty-six years ago, when they were less competent to exercise the franchise. A greater amount of representation with a less amount of fitness was not found to be injurious, but wholesome, for the State ; and now, when, as you admit, there is a greater amount of fitness, and, as you must grant, a less amount of representation, you are not disposed to accede to a further measure of enfranchisement. If these are not good reasons for extending the suffrage at the present, I know not what reason can be good. But if hon. Members think they can hold their ground in a policy of resistance

and refusal for the present, I have to ask them, how do they regard the future? My right hon. friend the Member for Calne<sup>1</sup> has prophesied to us, in the most emphatic terms, the ruin of the British Constitution. His prophecies were beautiful so far as his masterly use of the English language is concerned. But many prophecies quite as good may be found in the pages of Mr. Burke and Mr. Canning, and other almost equally distinguished men. What has been the fate of those prophecies? What use do they now serve? They form admirable material of declamations for schoolboys, and capital exercise to be translated into Greek. The prophecies of my right hon. friend, like those of even greater men than he, may some thirty years hence serve a similar purpose. They may, for the beauty and force of their language, be selected by teachers at colleges and schools as exercises for their pupils, and my right hon. friend will have his reward, as others have had theirs. *Ut pueris placeas et declamatio fias.* My hon. friend says we know nothing about the labouring classes. Is not one single word a sufficient reply? That word is Lancashire; Lancashire, associated with the sufferings of the last four years, so painful and bitter in themselves to contemplate, but so nobly and gloriously borne? The qualities then exhibited were the qualities not of select men here and there among a depraved multitude, but of the mass of a working community. The sufferings were sufferings of the mass. The heroism was heroism of the mass. For my own part, I cannot believe that the men who exhibited those qualities were only a sample of the people of England, and that the rest would have wholly failed in exhibiting the same great qualities had occasion arisen. I cannot see what argument could be found for some wise and temperate experiment of the extension of civil rights among such people, if the experience of the past few years does not sufficiently afford it.

And now, Sir, let us for a moment consider the enormous and silent changes which have been going forward among the labouring population. May I use the words to hon. and right hon. gentlemen once used by way of exhortation by Sir Robert Peel to his opponents, "elevate your vision"? Let us try and raise our views above the fears, the suspicions, the jealousies, the reproaches, and the recriminations of this place and this occasion. Let us look onward to the time of our children and of our children's children. Let us know what preparation it behoves us should be made for that coming time. Is there or is there not,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

I ask, a steady movement of the labouring classes, and is or is not that movement a movement onwards and upwards? I do not say that it falls beneath the eye, for, like all great processes, it is unobservable in detail, but as solid and undeniable as it is resistless in its essential character. It is like those movements of the crust of the earth which science tells us are even now going on in certain portions of the globe. The sailor courses over them in his vessel, and the traveller by land treads them without being conscious of these changes; but from day to day, from hour to hour, the heaving forces are at work, and after a season we discern from actual experience that things are not as they were. Has my right hon. friend, in whom mistrust rises to its utmost height, ever really considered the astonishing phenomena connected with some portion of the conduct of the labouring classes, especially in the Lancashire distress? Has he considered what an amount of self-denial was exhibited by these men in respect to the American war? They knew that the source of their distress lay in the war, yet they never uttered or entertained the wish that any effort should be made to put an end to it, as they held it to be a war for justice and for freedom. Could any man have believed that a conviction so still, so calm, so firm, so energetic, could have planted itself in the minds of a population without becoming a known patent fact throughout the whole country? But we knew nothing of it. And yet when the day of trial came we saw that noble sympathy on their part with the people of the North; that determination that, be their sufferings what they might, no word should proceed from them that would hurt a cause which they so firmly believed to be just. On one side there was a magnificent moral spectacle; on the other side was there not also a great lesson to us all, to teach us that in those little tutored, but yet reflective minds, by a process of quiet instillation, opinions and sentiments gradually form themselves of which we for a long time remain unaware, but which, when at last they make their appearance, are found to be deep-rooted, mature and ineradicable? And now, Sir I ask my noble friend how he proposes to administer the government of that singularly associated family of persons who adopt this Amendment? There ought to be some unity of purpose among those friends and associates who have linked themselves together on a question such as this; among those who design to overturn Governments, or to destroy Reform Bills. I will state a portion of the contradictions that are to be gathered out of this debate on one side only. My noble friend

says we ought to have referred this question to the Committee of Privy Council. But the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge <sup>1</sup> tells him, and tells him truly, that it would be totally useless ; firstly, it would do no good, and secondly, it would be entirely unconstitutional. That is the first specimen I give. Next, my right hon. friend says we ought to have introduced a measure of re-distribution ; but the right hon. gentleman the Member for Stroud <sup>2</sup> and the hon. Member for Galway <sup>3</sup> say they would have been content, the one to support our Franchise Bill, and both to entertain and discuss it, if we had said nothing about re-distribution. Again, my hon. friend the Member for Wick <sup>4</sup> says we ought to proceed with the two Bills *pari passu*, but my right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University <sup>5</sup> says, and supports his opinion with reasoning to show, that such a course of proceeding would only involve increased delay. The right hon. Member for Calne <sup>6</sup> says that would remove none of his objections. The right hon. Member for Bucks,<sup>7</sup> I think, says the same, and yet the hon. Member for Wick says that if only we will adopt his advice he will ensure for our obtaining every vote on the Liberal side of the House. The hon. and learned Member for Belfast <sup>8</sup> says representation is founded on classes. My right hon. friend (Mr. Walpole) says, “ No, it is not founded on classes, but on communities.” The hon. and learned Member for Belfast says fitness is not a ground for enfranchisement ; and the right hon. Baronet the Member for Herts <sup>9</sup> says not merely that he would be satisfied, but with emphatic and expressive gesture that he would be delighted if every artizan who is fit for the franchise could be admitted to it. The noble Lord the Member for Galway <sup>10</sup> not only declares his adhesion to Reform, but states that it is in the capacity of an ardent Reformer that he objects to our measure ; while the right hon. and gallant General the Member for Huntingdon<sup>11</sup> frames a catalogue of the mischief we have had to endure during the Reforming era, and seems to consider that we have had not only enough of Reform in Parliament, but even a little more than enough. The hon. Member for Cambridge<sup>12</sup> says, I think very truly, that Parliament is pledged in this matter, not, of course, to do what they think wrong ; nobody ever said anything so absurd ; but what is meant is this—that those pledges of Parliament are pledges which, if they are not observed,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.      <sup>2</sup> Mr. E. Horsman.      <sup>3</sup> Lord Dunkellin.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. S. Laing.      <sup>5</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.      <sup>6</sup> Mr. Robert Lowe.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Disraeli.      <sup>8</sup> Sir Hugh Cairns.      <sup>9</sup> Sir E. Bulwer-Lytton.

<sup>10</sup> Lord Dunkellin.      <sup>11</sup> General Peel.      <sup>12</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.

will cause discredit to Parliament and will tend to the disparagement of Parliamentary Government with the country. But while my right hon. friend says that Parliament is pledged, the hon. Member for Dublin<sup>1</sup> and the right hon. Member for Bucks<sup>2</sup> have laboured to demonstrate that it is under no pledge whatever. Lastly, Sir, the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire<sup>3</sup> says he is an ardent friend of Reform. I will not contradict him—that would not be good manners, neither will I cite against him the words of any other gentleman. But I will cite his own words or opinions. I conceive that in his judgment—a most untrue and injurious judgment as I think—he has contradicted himself; because he avowedly and pointedly glories in Lord Palmerston as being a man whose life, if it had only been prolonged, would have effectually kept at bay any new Reform Bill. That, Sir, which I have represented in these references, is the state of self-contradiction among this party, a party gathered together for a chance purpose, with no bond of cohesion and no declared principle, with no avowed intention—meaning, as I must repeat, one thing and saying another thing—saying that which is comparatively small account—not saying but suppressing the thing which the most important persons in it deeply feel, and which they would wish to say. Such is the state of things among our present opponents, such is their harmony of language, their unity of view, upon this the first and only occasion on which they have been able to co-operate.

Sir, the hour has arrived when this protracted debate must come to an end. (*Cheers.*) I cannot resent the warmth with which that last expression of mine has been re-echoed. My apologies to the House are sincere. I feel deeply indebted, not to gentlemen sitting on this side of the House only, but also and not less to hon. gentlemen opposite, for the patience with which they have heard me. But a very few words more, and I have done. May I speak briefly to hon. gentlemen opposite, as some of them have addressed advice to gentlemen on this side of the House. I would ask them, “Will you not consider, before you embark in this new crusade, whether the results of those other crusades in which you have heretofore engaged have been so satisfactory to you as to encourage you to repeat the operation?” Great battles you have fought, and fought them manfully. The battle of maintaining civil disabilities on account of religious belief, the battle of resisting the first Reform Act, the obstinate

<sup>1</sup> Mr. B. L. Guinness.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Disraeli.<sup>3</sup> Lord Elcho.

and long-continued battle of Protection, all these great battles have been fought by the great party that I see opposite ; and, as to some portion of those conflicts, I admit my own share of the responsibility. But I ask, again, have their results—have their results towards yourselves—been such as that you should be disposed to renew struggles such as these ? Certainly those who compose the Liberal party here, at least in that capacity have no reason or title to find fault. The effect of your course has been to give them for five out of every six, or for six out of every seven years since the epoch of the Reform Act the conduct and management of public affairs. The effect has been to lower, to reduce, and contract your just influence in the country, and to abridge your legitimate share in the administration of the Government. It is good for the public interest that you should be strong ; but if you are to be strong, you can only be so by showing, in addition to the kindness and the personal generosity which I am sure you feel towards the people, a public, a political trust and confidence in them. What I now say can hardly be said with an evil motive, I am conscious of no such sentiment towards any man or party. But, Sir, we are assailed ; this Bill is in a state of crisis and of peril, and the Government along with it. We stand or fall with it, as has been declared by my noble friend Lord Russell. We stand with it now ; we may fall with it a short time hence. If we do so fall, we, or others in our places, shall rise with it hereafter. I shall not attempt to measure with precision the forces that are to be arrayed against us in the coming issue. Perhaps the great division of to-night is not the last that must take place in the struggle. At some point of the contest you may possibly succeed. You may drive us from our seats. You may bury the Bill that we have introduced, but we will write upon its gravestone for an epitaph this line, with certain confidence in its fulfilment—

“*Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.*”

You cannot fight against the future. Time is on our side. The great social forces which move onwards in their might and majesty, and which the tumult of our debates does not for a moment impede or disturb—those great social forces are against you ; they are marshalled on our side ; and the banner which we now carry in this fight, though perhaps at some moment it may droop over our sinking heads, yet it soon again will float in the eye of heaven, and it will be borne by the firm hands of the united people of the three kingdoms, perhaps not to an easy, but to a certain and to a not distant victory.

# IRISH CHURCH BILL

## REPLY ON THE SECOND READING

MARCH 23, 1869

In the year 1868 Gladstone had, as Leader of the Opposition, moved and carried in the House of Commons Resolutions directed against the principle of maintaining an Established Church in Ireland. His chief arguments were that members of that Church formed a small minority of the Irish population ; that with all its artificial advantages it had never made any progress ; that while most Irishmen were Roman Catholics, a considerable number were Presbyterians ; and that the privileges of a small religious body, connected with the Church of England by the Act of Union, were a just cause of national discontent. He accordingly proposed that the Irish Church should be severed from the Church of England, and from the State ; that the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical Courts in Ireland should cease ; that the disestablished Church should retain all ecclesiastical fabrics, and all endowments received since the Act of Uniformity in 1662 ; and that, subject to compensation for vested interests, the remaining endowments of the Church should be applied to public purposes for the benefit of all classes in Ireland. After these Resolutions had been carried against Mr. Disraeli's Government Parliament was dissolved, and the first General Election since the Reform Act of 1867 resulted in a large Liberal majority.

Early in 1869 Gladstone, having become Prime Minister, introduced a Bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. The following speech, which was delivered in reply at the close of the debate on the second reading, is a remarkable instance of the readiness and power with which he could survey the whole of a question, and at the same time deal with every essential point raised in the course of the discussion. He was dealing with very formidable adversaries, including Sir Roundell Palmer on his own side of the House, who had submitted the Bill to a hostile and exhaustive criticism. His object, therefore, was at once expository and defensive. Without being needlessly controversial he replied to every material argument and objection that had been advanced from any quarter. So far as the case for the Bill was concerned, he left nothing more to be said.

**M**R. SPEAKER, I think, Sir, that both sides of the House must be agreed at least in this—that the right hon. gentleman who has just sat down <sup>1</sup> has drawn a picture of the state of Ireland which is equally remarkable and deplorable. The right hon. gentleman's picture consists of two parts. On the one side he looks at the system of law, govern-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gathorne Hardy.

ment, and institutions in Ireland, and there all is well. On the other hand, he looks at the people of Ireland—at the religion of the people of Ireland, at the relations between the people of Ireland and the ministers of their religion, and there, unfortunately, all is ill. Mr. Burke said in one of his memorable compositions that he did not know how to bring an indictment against a nation. For bringing an indictment against a nation commend me to the right hon. gentleman. Irish grievances—where are they? The right hon. gentleman says he looks in vain for the grievances of Ireland. On the state of land tenure the right hon. gentleman has nothing to say, except to indulge in criticisms on the language of my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade.<sup>1</sup> With regard to the Established Church of Ireland, though theoretically it may involve some departure from religious equality, has he not proved to us that it is a great blessing to that country? Has he not told us, grossly, as I think, though no doubt unintentionally, misinterpreting the terms used by a Judge, that in Ireland there are no wrongs unredressed? And yet what does he complain of? Of the wholesale sympathy on the part of the great part of the population with Fenian agitators and criminals. Of sympathy, not only with political, but with private crime; and in the relations between the people and their clergy the right hon. gentleman can see nothing but influence misused. This is the state of things he depicts as existing in Ireland; and I ask him, where are his remedies? The picture which he presents to us is, so far as the Irish people are concerned, nothing but a picture of black despair. He speaks of promoting the repeal of the Union, and because some clergyman in Ireland, dignified it appears, by the title of arch-deacon, has lately become a Repealer, the right hon. gentleman, searching for the cause of this strange opinion, thinks it can be found nowhere except in a line and a half of a speech delivered by myself some thirty-three years ago. There are, however, I would remind him, other modes of promoting a repeal of the Union, and of these no mode is so cogent in its effect in tending to bring about what I, for one, must regard as so deplorable a result, as that which is made use of by an English Statesman who gives us such highly-coloured statements with respect to the condition of the Irish people, as to the origin of which he has, it seems to me, furnished us with a most inaccurate account. By leaving on record his charges against the Irish people with his

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.

vindication of the Government and laws of this country, he does, I cannot help feeling, all that in him lies to drive that people to despair. The right hon. gentleman reminds us that the Fenians have not asked for the abolition of the Church in Ireland. No, that is very true ; so far as that goes, the Fenians and the right hon. gentleman are exactly in the same position. (" Oh ! ") In precisely the same position, I was about to say, with respect to that demand. I hope I was not understood as imputing it to the right hon. gentleman for a moment that he does not support the Irish Church Establishment from the most honourable and conscientious, though I think, mistaken motives. The Fenians, differing from him entirely in their views with respect to that Church, are the very last persons to demand its abolition, because it serves their purpose that it should remain as it now stands. Whatever serves to estrange the minds of the Irish population from Imperial rule, British sympathies, and from their Protestant fellow-countrymen on both sides of the water, is of all things the most precious part of the Fenian stock-in-trade, and it would ill suit their purpose indeed to ask to have the Church in Ireland abolished. The right hon. gentleman at the commencement of his speech vindicated, as I thought, with perfect propriety, his right to overlook, that is to go back beyond, the occurrences of the last twelve or fifteen months, to argue this question as if it were a new question, as if there had been no vote of the last Parliament, as if there had been no declaration of the national conviction at the election, as if there had been no resignation of the late Government, no abandonment of Office by the right hon. gentleman himself without soliciting the judgment of the House of Commons, because the opinions and principles on which he sought to govern Ireland, and which he has set forth with great force to-night, were opinions and principles which he knew could not be accepted by the country. I might, indeed, say, as far as the right hon. gentleman is concerned, it appears, after all, that the appeal made the other night by my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade<sup>1</sup> was utterly vain—for, with respect to the right hon. gentleman, there is no Irish crisis and there is no Irish question. All he says we want is a few years of peaceful industry, as though peaceful industry can be adopted at a moment's notice by a whole people ; or else, if not so adopted, the entire responsibility of the want of it, and of the evils that may ensue, rests with that people itself, and in no respect with

<sup>1</sup> Mr. John Bright.

those under whose tutelage, under whose care, and under whose Government that people has been for the last 600 years. Upon this point the right hon. gentleman has materially retrograded. For him there is no Irish question now, but surely there was an Irish question last year when he was a Member of a Cabinet sitting upon this Bench, and heard in silence the speech of Lord Mayo, also a Member of that Cabinet, in which Lord Mayo asserted the gravity of this Irish question, and did not tell us that we were to bring home to the door of the Irish peasant, and leave there, the whole charge of the evils and mischief with which Ireland teems. Surely there was an Irish question when the right hon. gentleman heard Lord Mayo tell us that he thought the state of the land question so grave that he should introduce a Bill on the following Monday—though unfortunately we never saw the Bill—giving to Irish tenants compensation for their improvements; and when, with respect to education, he told us that the time was come when it would be well to found a Roman Catholic University, supported from the Consolidated Fund; and when, thirdly, with respect to the Church question, so far from seeing that happy, beneficent state of things which the right hon. gentleman delights to contemplate, he said that there were serious evils, that the absence of religious equality was a grievance, and that there would be no objection to remove that grievance and that religious inequality, provided it were done by the endowment of new Churches and not by the disendowment of old ones. I am sorry to remind the right hon. gentleman in this somewhat pointed manner of the difference of his conduct now, when he is loosened from the trammels of Office, and enjoys the freedom of Opposition. The right hon. gentleman, having recovered his freedom, makes a very liberal use of it, for he seems to think that he has nothing to do but to state that if there have been any evils connected with the people of Ireland they have been removed long ago, and that it is invidious to lead us to believe that any of the evils remain, and further that if, in fact, there are any evils remaining, no part of the responsibility rests with us, and that the whole responsibility is upon the shoulders of the people of Ireland and of her clergy. Our situation, certainly, is broadly different from that of the right hon. gentleman. He draws this hopeless picture, and for it he does not offer even the shadow of a remedy; but he hinted that he had a right to assume that some measure would pass to put the Church Establishment in Ireland in a satisfactory condition. If I may say so

without offence, I think that this is a most audacious assumption to be made by a public man. Not to cite any measure, carefully to avoid identifying himself with its provisions, in no way explaining the propositions which he brought forward, making himself responsible for nothing, not having said so much as this—that evils of any kind would have been redressed by it, the right hon. gentleman thinks that he is entitled to assume that a measure has been imagined and invented, and which, if he has imagined and invented it, he takes care not to describe, and that having been so imagined and invented would have been passed into a law, and that it would have had an operation which would be for the purposes of his argument and for those purposes alone. I think that I am justified in saying that the right hon. gentleman offers us nothing. He has presented to us a sad and grievous picture ; but I think it is so unjust to the people of Ireland as to amount to a libel on their character. He has nothing to suggest or promise by way of producing a better state of things beyond that salutary precept that he inculcates that habits of industry and a uniform regard for the laws should be adopted by the people. Our position is very different. We do not see in the state of Ireland anything but the aggravated result of the inveterate mischiefs which raged with fury in these islands until within the last generation, and which, though abated in many and important respects, have left behind so much of painful and angry recollections, and so much also of actual difficulty and suffering and grievance—while as yet no sufficient attempt has been made to apply a remedy, that we have had reason to regard the condition of Ireland as a problem beyond our powers to solve. We have, of course, as the people of Ireland have, to lament, and as every one has to lament in himself the corruptions, the impurities, and the weaknesses of human nature ; but those imperfections have been found in equal proportion in their rulers, and it is an axiom in politics that where these inveterate mischiefs prevail, and have prevailed for centuries, the final judgment of posterity and the sentence of just men will be that the chief responsibility lies where the chief power has been—with the rulers of the country, and with the classes possessing property in it. We, therefore, Sir, attempt to propose a remedy, and that remedy the right hon. gentleman knows must be proposed piecemeal. We cannot lay upon the table at one and the same moment all the measures for which the state of Ireland appears to us to call. We come forward, therefore, with a Bill for the purpose of dis-

establishing and disendowing the now Established Church of Ireland. Of course, it was to be expected that the right hon. gentleman would be merciless and unsparing in his criticisms on the details of the Bill. I am sorry it has not been better understood. He complains, for example—and that was the main head of his complaint—that the annuities we offered to incumbents are accompanied with conditions of service. Has he inquired of his friends in the Irish Church how they would have liked that those annuities should be absolutely given? No, Sir, he has not; at least, I will venture to say he knows not the sentiment in the Irish Church on the subject. But it has been our duty to make inquiry into the matter, and the truth is that, consistently with the very sentiments expressed by the right hon. gentleman near me, and which he thinks we have abjured, we do not attach conditions of service to the annuities of incumbents for the sake of their congregations—(“ Oh, oh ! ”)—yes, for the sake of their congregations, who, we thought, had a right to retain the benefit of their labours, and for the sake of the religious body with which they are connected, and we think that if we had proposed these annuities without conditions, and knowing that to be the general opinion, we should have done much to disorganize and possibly to destroy. But if the right hon. gentleman opposite wishes to bring this particular matter to a test, let him give notice of a Motion in Committee to substitute for the proposition we make an unconditional, instead of a conditional, annuity, and I venture to say he will find himself mistaken as to the result.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: You did not let the incumbent take other preferment.

MR. GLADSTONE: I say he can take other preferment in concert with the authorities of his Church. Without any interference from us to settle with the authorities of his Church the terms of his commutation, he may retain his right under it to the end, and take any preferment he likes. I therefore challenge the right hon. gentleman to give notice of the Amendment at which he has glanced, when we shall see what left-handed service he has been endeavouring to give to his friends in the Irish Church, in whom he, no doubt, takes a great interest. The House will be assured that I will not follow the right hon. gentleman in detail over the extensive ground he has traversed in his able speech. I think that, so far as criticisms on the details are concerned, there are none of them on which we are to give our opinion to-night can possibly depend, and therefore it is better to let them pass by in

the fewest words. I will only say that I think when we come into Committee, it will not be found practicable to induce the House to see, as he sees, that in the £350,000 or £400,000—it is somewhere between the two—which the 4,500,000 of Roman Catholics in Ireland may get out of this arrangement, there is any monstrous or undue favouritism, while the £6,500,000, besides the churches and glebe houses, may go to the ministers or servants of the Church, or the body representing it. There is nothing to be read but the evidence of our harshness and injustice. With regard to the disputed question of the date of the private endowments of 1660, I know very well that this is a matter on which much may be said *pro* and *con*. But I own to my belief that if the opponents of this Bill succeed in shaking the conviction I entertain with regard to the propriety of the choice of that epoch, I, for one, am more likely to be shaken in the sense of doubting whether we ought to go so far back than in the sense of raising the question of being driven back farther. I may claim to know something of the matter when I am stating what are likely to be the processes of my own mind. I am not so audacious as to assume that the processes of the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite may sympathize with my own. Several gentlemen said that it would be extremely unjust to charge the Maynooth compensation and the *Regium Donum* upon the Church Fund of Ireland rather than upon the Consolidated Fund of this country. It has also been said that the proceeding we have adopted is not in conformity with the pledges we have given, and some have said, I think, with the Preamble of the Bill. At the proper time we shall be able to show that this proceeding is in strict conformity with all the words that we have spoken, and with the Preamble of the Bill. Neither of these things, perhaps, much affects the merits of the question; but upon the merits we shall state to the House at the proper time the reasons—and I think they are sufficient and conclusive reasons—which have led us to propose that these compensations should be paid out of the Church Fund of Ireland. Without in any manner raising a prejudice to the question which the Irish Members may think fit to found on the subject of a claim on the Consolidated Fund, or any other claim of a financial kind on behalf of that country, that is not one of the corner stones of the Bill. I do think that justice requires us to hold firmly—subject always to considerations of mere detail—by the moderate compensation we propose for Roman Catholics and Presbyterians; but as regards the question of the source from which those compensations

are to be derived, there is no such foregone conclusion, I presume to say, in the minds of the Government as to prevent the fairest and freest discussion of the question.

So much for the criticism upon our plan in its details. What is far more important is to consider what are the plans or methods, if any, that have been placed in competition with the plan of the Government as the best method of dealing with the great ecclesiastical difficulty of Ireland. And I have shown that the right hon. gentleman who has just sat down has no method whatever. Nor can I fail to remark one most extraordinary circumstance. It will be remembered that upon every occasion, during the debates of last year, our conduct in proposing Resolutions and legislation with respect to the Irish Church, was denounced by gentlemen opposite, not only as unwise, but as eminently factious. And what was the reason adduced in proof that our conduct was thus factious? It was this—that the question of the Irish Church had been referred to a Royal Commission, that the Commission was to produce a plan for its settlement, and we, without waiting for their plan, insisted upon propositions of our own. That was the proof of the factious character of our conduct. At different times during the Session—when I suppose it was thought expedient in connexion with the progress of debate—hopes were held out that the Commission was very hard at work, and likely to report—I remember the Home Secretary promising—almost immediately. However, we were not drawn off from the track; and I am thankful to say we went on with our work, and performed it, as to all that depended upon us, giving thereby to the country those pledges of the reality and solidity of our intentions which enabled the country to meet us in a corresponding spirit, resulting in that manifestation of the national will of which we are to look for another sign in the division of to-night. The Report of the Commission has appeared. No doubt, every gentleman on that side has read not only the Report, but the whole of the Schedules. They must, every one of them, be intimately acquainted with it, and yet not a man in this debate has ventured to set up as a mode of dealing with the Church question of Ireland the plan proposed by the Report of the Commission. Surely that is a fact remarkable enough in itself; but it is more remarkable still when you consider whom you have got in the House—not the official head of the Commission, but its working mind. Great injustice is done to the right hon. and learned gentleman the Member for Dublin University<sup>1</sup> if he is not the father of the Report. And yet, with

<sup>1</sup> Dr. J. T. Ball.

a total absence of parental feeling, he delivers, for two hours, a speech of the utmost ability and learning in this House, going over everything, condemning on this side, approving on that, having a word to say for all things, and for everybody, except for the Report of his own Commission. Really, Sir, if it were possible for an inanimate production to be conscious of that sort of compassion which we ought to bestow on the woes and miseries of a fellow-creature, I should feel it all for the Report of this Commission. Ushered into the world with promisings and trumpetings sufficient for a Royal birth—the period for the preparation of its entering into light equal to that taken by the longest-lived animals in the business of gestation—it was considered by every member of the great party then constituting the Government to be certain to contain in itself the means of solving this most difficult problem ; then to issue forth, and to be brought into the light, to be treated worse than the child of a beggar woman, for even such a child would be looked after by the parish—this Report seems to be put behind the fire, and the act of murder is performed by the hands of the father. The Report of the Commission, however, would not have attracted this kind of criticism for the purpose of attempting to fix anything in the nature of ridicule upon the labours of the persons who composed that Commission. They have failed, and failed egregiously, not from their own fault, but because they undertook a hopeless problem. They undertook the task of reforming that which is irreformable—that which you cannot reform in one sense without worsening its case in, perhaps, twenty other senses. If they committed an error, it was in undertaking to examine the question of re-constructing an institution like the Established Church in Ireland, that has entirely outlived its day. It had outlived its day, in my opinion, when it became evident that the plans of Queen Elizabeth could not possibly be fulfilled for the conversion of the people of Ireland to the Protestant religion. They may have erred in this respect. But I refer to this Report because the plans it has proposed represent to us the utmost and the best that the ablest man can do, fortified with Government authority, having the advantage of lengthened period of time for consideration, and of unbroken consultation ; and when such a Report as this proceeds from such men as these, and is so treated by its parents, I say we are justified, if ever there was a negative demonstration in the world, in saying that the time has come when every man standing on this floor is entitled and bound to say that what is called the reform of the Church of

Ireland, by cutting and clipping and paring, by taking away a little here, and putting in a little there, and shifting money from one part of the country to another, has become utterly hopeless, and ought to be discarded from the category of those objects which are to be taken into the view of practical politicians. The right hon. and learned gentleman, I must say, I think, treated the Report more favourably than the right hon. gentleman who **has** just sat down, for he did point out methods of proceeding in Ireland. The right hon. gentleman disclaimed any intention of offering any disrespect to the Roman Catholics in Ireland. I accept that disclaimer in good part—it was most sincerely offered, and not only offered but proved ; because the right hon. gentleman instead of that niggardly line of comment, so to call it, which has been adopted by the right hon. gentleman the late Home Secretary, who thinks he can possibly scrape two or three years from the Maynooth compensation, commented not only in a different, but in a contradictory sense, and said that the proposal in respect of Maynooth was insufficient and ungenerous. The right hon. gentleman announced pretty distinctly a mode of dealing with the Church question in Ireland. I think that he was in some degree, in this matter, a disciple of the school of reticence, but he certainly went beyond the right hon. gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire.<sup>1</sup> The right hon. gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire last year did not express his opinions at the time when we heard that speech from Lord Mayo ; but he has been extremely cautious and circumspect with regard to the repetition of those opinions ever since. Sir, when we cannot live on the food placed upon the table we must live on the crumbs that fall from it. In dealing with the real substantial and responsible scheme of the Government for dealing with the Irish Church, it is a matter of great importance to know whether any hon. gentlemen, and especially hon. gentlemen opposite, have on any occasion brought any scheme into competition with it. The hon. Member for Mayo,<sup>2</sup> speaking his mind like a man, said that he tended towards an endowment of the three Churches—a general endowment ; and my hon. friend the Member for Galway,<sup>3</sup> with that frankness and courage which he always displays, avowed that this plan of general endowment was the plan and the policy which he would prefer, though I think he added that it was now too late to propose it. There can, therefore, be no room for hesitation or doubt as to the policy of those two hon. gentlemen, though both I

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.    <sup>2</sup> Mr. G. H. Moore.    <sup>3</sup> Mr. W. H. Gregory.

think accompanied their opinions with the expression of a fear that the time for its establishment had gone by. But when I come to the right hon. gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire,<sup>1</sup> I found much greater difficulty in understanding what he means ; because he said that one of the great causes—indeed, it was the only cause he mentioned—of the discontent and disorder in Ireland was the complaint that she had one unendowed Church and clergy. He went on to say that, if this Bill passed instead of having one unendowed Church and clergy we should have three, and he suggested that this, instead of being a remedy for a mischief, would be a means of aggravating it. I am therefore driven to the conclusion that either the right hon. gentleman, like his colleague who sits near him,<sup>2</sup> had no plan for dealing with the Church of Ireland or that, if he has a plan, it was the same one as was announced by his Government from these Benches twelve months ago—the plan vulgarly called “levelling up”—leaving the Established Church her endowments, raising the endowments of the Presbyterians to a worthier standard, and combining that with a liberal endowment for the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. This, at all events, I am safe in saying is the only plan indicated from the other side. I have heard very nearly the whole of this debate, and if any hon. gentleman has intimated a latent kindness for the Report of the Commission,<sup>3</sup> and I have done him a wrong in supposing that no one has given such an intimation, I hope he will forgive me ; but, as far as I am aware, the plan of endowing the three Churches, which must, of course, be accompanied by some scheme of endowment for the Methodists and other sects, is the only one—I will not say laid down—but glanced at or insinuated as a rival to the plan of the Government. What are we to say to that plan ? It is to be disposed of very briefly. A phrase has come into use among some of the Irish clergy. Some of them say—“ We are prepared to accept the inevitable,” but I have not heard that any of them have said—“ We are prepared to accept the impossible.” If this plan of the three Churches was really entertained by the right hon. gentleman, why was it not announced at the hustings—at those hustings where every effort was made to represent us as being in secret league with the Pope of Rome, and when the honour and credit of Protestantism were in nearly every case—to his honour I except the name of the right hon. and gallant gentleman the Member for North Lancashire<sup>3</sup>—sought to be monopolized by the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Disraeli.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gathorne Hardy.<sup>3</sup> Colonel Wilson-Patten.

party opposite? Why was not this plan, which is the only one about which they have ventured to hint as a remedy for the Church difficulties of Ireland, proposed, or at least mentioned, at the hustings? The voices were very inarticulate voices, and it is either the plan of the party opposite—in which case, as it is an impossible plan, it is needless to discuss it—or they have no plan at all. My hon. and learned friend the Member for Richmond<sup>1</sup> came to the rescue, and he certainly proposed a plan, and this plan, the product of a mind as ingenuous as it is powerful and accomplished, was received as a kind of godsend by a large number of hon. gentlemen opposite. As every suggestion made by my hon. and learned friend is entitled to respectful consideration, I shall not apologize for adverting to the character of that plan even at this late hour. The opinions of my hon. and learned friend were the more important, because his doctrine of property has been much accepted by authorities and speakers on the other side of the House, and because of the general cheering with which his declaration was greeted. I understand the fundamental doctrine of my hon. and learned friend to be that property given for the purposes and use of a portion of the community ought not to be withdrawn from that portion of the community except in certain definite cases. One of these cases I understood to be where the property was excessive in amount, in which case, according to my hon. and learned friend, it might be reduced. Another definite case was when the purpose to which the property was addressed was either absurd or bad in itself. And my hon. and learned friend, I think, finally glanced at a third cause which would justify the interposition of the Legislature—such misconduct in the administration of the funds as would be sufficient to warrant a forfeiture. Though I think that enumeration very well as far as it goes, I must claim on the part of the Legislature a larger and more extended right, and acknowledge myself bound by a much more comprehensive duty. It seems to me that when property has been given for a purpose that is not attained, and that cannot be attained, it is then the duty of the Legislature to see that that property is no longer wasted. I am putting the matter low, because, instead of being no longer wasted, if I were to state the full justification of our measure it would be rather this—where, even without the fault of the parties immediately concerned, the actual use and administration of a property, being totally different from that for which it is given, is likewise attended

<sup>1</sup> Sir Roundell Palmer.

with the gravest political and social mischiefs, then the obligation of the Legislature to interfere is imperative. So far I listened with satisfaction to the speech of the hon. and learned gentleman, for he rose above the purely legal doctrine of trust for the whole community of the Church. I agree with the hon. and learned gentleman in his extension of the doctrine ; but I ask him to go with me to extend it still further, and to say there is a trust—whether in the legal sense I know not—but in the political, the social, the moral sense there is a trust impressed upon this property, from first to last, for the benefit of the nation. It was for the nation that the property was given. It is true it was given to corporations. Yes ; but why ? Not that they might enjoy it as private property, but that they might hold it on condition of duty. They were, as the hon. and learned gentleman truly says, only convenient symbols—convenient media for its conveyance from generation to generation. The real meaning, scope, and object was that through them it should be applied for all time to the benefit of the entire population of the kingdom, and this was a natural and intelligent arrangement when the entire nation was of one faith. In proportion as Dissent and difference of opinion creep into the country, the foundation of the religious Establishment so endowed comes to be by degrees more or less weakened and impaired, partly in proportion as the number of Dissenters is strong, partly in proportion as they are disposed or not disposed to acquiesce in the continuance of the Establishment. But when we come to a case like that of Ireland ; when that which was given for the whole people has come to be appropriated for the enjoyment of a mere handful of the people ; and when at the same time the property so enjoyed, while it remains in the hands of those who now hold it, is associated with the recollection of all the grievances and bitter misfortunes that have afflicted that country, so that the chain of the ecclesiastical and civil history of Ireland consists in fact of two strands, one of which cannot possibly be unwound and separated from the other, I must decline to go into any court of justice, created for the purpose of administering the laws, in order to ascertain the rules by which they are bound. We are called to a function and avocation which, in my opinion, is a yet higher one ; we are to look for the principles of right in a broader, and for such a case, a truer aspect, and from that responsibility we cannot escape. We ought to be grateful to my hon. and learned friend for the distance in respect of that portion of our journey which he is content to travel in our

company, because considering the hard words of which we are the object, I think it requires some courage on his part to acknowledge us and to recognize us in any degree. My hon. and learned friend gives up the Establishment of the Church. I do not wonder that my right hon. friend the Member for the University of Cambridge<sup>1</sup> entered a protest on this subject. In giving up the Establishment of the Church my hon. and learned friend gives up the greater part, and I think the higher part, I am bound to say the higher and the worthier part, of the whole argument. All that relates to the consecration of the State by its union with the Church—all that relates to the supremacy of the Crown—all that relates to the constitutional argument as well as to the religious argument, disappears along with disestablishment ; and my hon. and learned friend becomes open to that withering accusation which was delivered in a moment of extraordinary fervour by the right hon. gentleman the Member for Buckinghamshire<sup>2</sup> last year, when he described that awful conspiracy between Romanists and Ritualists for undermining the Throne by the denial of the Royal supremacy. But permit me to say the Royal supremacy is not denied or taken away by this Bill. The Royal supremacy has been developed in various forms at various periods of our history. It is the greatest mistake to suppose that since the Reformation the Royal supremacy has always been flowing, as it were, through the same channel. Most important and vital changes have been made with respect to the methods of its operation ; but I know of no legal or authoritative definition of the Law of Supremacy, except it be that which describes it as the fundamental principle which makes the Sovereign of this country supreme over all persons and in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil. That which is an ecclesiastical cause at one period of our history may not be an ecclesiastical cause at another period of our history ; that which was an ecclesiastical cause before the Court of High Commission has no existence as such in the present generation ; but as long as the Queen is supreme in every cause that can be brought into a court for the purpose whether of primary adjudication or of review, so long the Royal supremacy exists. If any one be prepared to question that doctrine, I ask them whether the Royal supremacy exists in Scotland at this moment or not ? If you hold that by this Bill the Royal supremacy is set aside, I defy you to maintain that there is a single rag or thread of Royal supremacy in Scotland. My hon. and learned friend is prepared—

<sup>1</sup> Mr. S. H. Walpole.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Disraeli.

I do not say that he proposes—but he is prepared to give up the estates of the sees, the property of the Commissioners, and he says he is prepared to give up certain of the parochial endowments of benefices. Of course, it would be impossible to fix any figure off-hand with decision ; but I believe he confined these cases of parochial endowments to populations of 200 persons. Whether he intended to reserve out of the revenues of these benefices any portion for the supply of spiritual instruction and ordinances I do not know, and I do not think he said ; but in this way my hon. and learned friend gives up one-third of the Church property of Ireland, and he proposes to retain the rest upon a rule which is, at any rate, perfectly intelligible.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER intimated that he would thus dispose of about one-half of that property.

MR. GLADSTONE : I am extremely glad to hear it is one-half instead of a third. I am delighted to hear he accompanies us only one inch further on our road. It gives me hope that possibly some day he will greatly improve his fractions. But my hon. and learned friend would retain the endowments in those cases where there is what I may call a congregation, not as denying that twenty people, or even ten people, may be a Christian congregation ; but, using the expression in the sense that he employs it when he speaks of “ a substantive congregation,” of which he thinks the law may take notice and cognizance. In this case my hon. and learned friend would retain the endowments. The first question which I should like to ask my hon. and learned friend is, whether there is upon the face of the earth, or in the history of legislation, any precedent for such a proceeding as he proposes ? and the reason I put that question to him is because he put that question to us. Now, I think it is quite plain that he has no precedent for it. I would not, however, condemn it on that ground alone, because in the circumstances of Ireland, such as they are, we are dealing with a case for which, I believe, there is no precedent in the civilized world. My hon. and learned friend certainly will not tell me that the case in which the Courts of the United States adjudged to the Episcopal Church of New York the property of which, I believe, the value at the time of the adjudication was somewhere about £2,000 a year—my hon. and learned friend, I say, will not tell me that that was a case in point ; especially upon this ground, that although that was a proof of a great regard of the American Government for corporate property, it was not property which had belonged to a religious communion of the

State of New York in the character of an Established Church. My hon. and learned friend will correct me if I am wrong ; but I do not think that the Anglican Church was ever an Established Church in the State of New York as it was in Virginia, and therefore it was a private society in which this endowment was continued. Well, then, let us see how this case stands in other matters. My hon. and learned friend by giving up the Establishment gives up the argument with regard to State religion and supremacy. Now, with respect to the means of spreading the doctrines of the Reformation, how does his plan recommend itself ? If we are to maintain the Established Church for the purpose of spreading the doctrines of the Reformation, we ought to maintain it all the more assiduously and zealously in those places where it is improbable that it would be able to maintain itself. Even the right hon. gentleman has come down somewhat from the high ground of last year, when he spoke of its being the glory of the Church to hold out the light of the Reformation all over Ireland, and he seems now to be disposed to withdraw—(MR. GATHORNE HARDY : No, no ! ) Well, then, he does not withdraw, but wishes to keep it in every parish of the land ; but my hon. and learned friend does not propose to do so—and even if he were to have certain flying curates passing from one village to another, serving different congregations as they passed along in the course of the Sunday, my hon. and learned friend will never tell me that this is the plan he would recommend for gaining proselytes, or the way he thinks the work of the Irish Church should be carried out.

Well, let me try the plan of my hon. and learned friend by the rules of general prudence. When you have a fund to distribute, and have not enough for everybody, to whom are you to give it ? Is it to those who want it and cannot do without it, or to those who do not want it and can supply themselves ? I should certainly have thought that on those principles the proper course was the former, but my hon. and learned friend's plan takes away funds from those scattered and poor Protestants on whose behalf appeals are constantly made to our commiseration, and gives it to those congregations which, according to every understood principle of reckoning in such matters, are capable of providing religious worship and religious instruction for themselves. Well, how does this plan stand as regards a great object which we have in view—namely, that of conciliating the Roman Catholic population of Ireland ? My hon. and learned friend must know

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Gathorne Hardy.

that it is not the possession of a larger or smaller portion of these endowments as national endowments that is objected to by the Roman Catholic population. It is that they should be held by the Protestants at all, and if he ruthlessly cuts away a moiety of the endowments, but leaves the other moiety in their hands, the cause of offence remains, and all the festering recollections connected with it would still continue to afflict the mass of the Irish people. My hon. and learned friend criticized the Bill with respect to the observance of the local principle. He quoted from a speech of mine a declaration in which I had said that in my opinion it was dangerously resembling an act of public plunder if—on the part of that handful of the Irish people who are in the possession of the ecclesiastical endowments—we were to take the tithes of a parish in Mayo or Galway to supply the wants of wealthy congregations in Dublin or Belfast; and he thought he had found—what I am quite sure he will be forward to admit when the matter is explained, he has not found—a great deviation in this Bill from that regard for the local purposes of these funds, which I had so strongly professed. If we had found it necessary to centralize those funds for a purpose of national and general benefit, it would have been a totally different matter from transferring them from the handful of Protestants in one neighbourhood for the uses of another handful in another; but we have done neither the one nor the other. I stated to the House in introducing the measure that, in our view, it was essential to the satisfactory character of any plan for disposing of the residue of the property that it should be equal in its application to the various parts of Ireland, and if my hon. and learned friend examines the matter he will find that it is not possible to devise any scheme which shall more exactly re-distribute the benefit of these funds than the scheme we have proposed. There is not one purpose to which we propose to apply them that does not reach over the whole of Ireland; there is not one purpose that does not regard and concern wants that are rising day by day in every parish of every county, nor is there one to which we do not propose by this plan to give an easy and practicable access to institutions which will be either maintained or assisted out of these funds. I am bound to say there yet remains one more objection to the plan of my hon. and learned friend. If he retains these endowments in the wealthier parishes of Ireland, it is quite plain to me that he cannot give to the Irish Church that which I find it determined to assert for itself—namely, an absolute legal freedom—for he proposes to maintain

benefices, and he will have to maintain the incidents of benefices, to maintain that part of the legal Church system which concerns the enjoyment of property under straight, rigid, and inflexible rules. Now, such retention of rules would, I am afraid, greatly interfere with that power of elastic adaptation of arrangements to wants and necessities all over Ireland to which members of the Established Church in Ireland look with sanguine hope as a principle enabling them to cope with the difficulties of the position. I therefore, Sir, feel bound to say that, great as is the respect which we have for the authority of my hon. and learned friend, it appears to me that we should do wrong were we to deviate from the plans we have adopted in the direction which he indicates to us.

And here let me say a word with regard to the application of the funds to lunatic asylums in answer to what fell from the noble Lord the Member for Middlesex<sup>1</sup>—a word which I say with great satisfaction, because it affords me an agreeable opportunity of acknowledging the remarkable ability that distinguished his first address to the House. But the noble Lord has not examined into the case of these institutions. He stated that the money of the Church would be given to sectarian lunatic asylums of which he gave three or four examples. (LORD GEORGE HAMILTON : I said it might be.) I think the noble Lord, naturally perhaps, assuming that we could not have any other but the worst and darkest intentions, went a little further and said they would be so applied. But those three instances named by the noble Lord were not instances of lunatic asylums at all, but were instances of hospitals which would not come within the provisions of the Bill. Now, instead of replying in detail on such a point, I would simply say this—that in the whole application of these residuary funds there is not involved the adoption of a single principle which is new to Parliament. If we are told that reformatories are not fit to receive any portion of these funds because reformatories are denominational, my answer is that these reformatories receive from year to year grants of the public money voted by Parliament ; and if they are fit to receive money contributed by the tax-payers of the three countries they are fit to receive money proceeding from the Church funds of Ireland. With regard to lunatic asylums, those asylums are exclusively governed by persons who are appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—that is to say, by officers who are responsible to Parliament. With respect to

<sup>1</sup> Lord George Hamilton.

county infirmaries, the noble Lord knows very well that although these institutions are very ill-governed at present, yet they are under government of a legal character, which must be fixed and appointed by us, and which must be under any new and amended system—if our policy is allowed to have its way—of a perfectly impartial and secular description.

Well, Sir, there is more that I should have liked to have said, were it not that the hands of the clock warn me that I ought to hasten to a close ; and I will, therefore, proceed to what—to use a phrase that I am afraid has given some offence, although it was not used with the intention of giving any—I may call the “winding-up” of my speech ; but I applied the phrase “winding up” to these money arrangements which I thought conveniently expressed what I meant. This measure has been—and I do not much complain of it—the object undoubtedly of very hard words—sacrilege, spoliation, perfidy. All these and two more have been used ; to which two I will now refer, because they were used by my right hon. friend the Member for North Devon<sup>1</sup> at a Conservative dinner, unless he be wronged by the reporters, on the 3rd of March, when he delivered a speech on this subject, which appears to me more highly seasoned than the one he addressed to the House. If I might venture to express an opinion on such a matter, I would recommend that when hon. gentlemen have strong things to say about public measures the best place is to say them in this House.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE : I shall be quite prepared to say it here at the proper time.

MR. GLADSTONE : I should say the proper time was in the course of this debate. I want to refer to his remarks, because I am satisfied with and somewhat proud of them. My right hon. friend said that when the English people understand the measure they will feel that it is unparalleled in its character, and that it combines a gigantic scheme of robbery, with a still worse system of bribery. Those words have given satisfaction to me for two reasons. In the first place, because my right hon. friend, having used those words, cannot possibly hereafter use any others that are worse, and therefore we know that we have touched the bottom. I have another source of satisfaction. It is just the kind of delineation and picture which, when drawn by a hostile hand, shows me that we have succeeded in the framing of our measure. When my right hon. friend says we have committed

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

robbery, what he means is that we have been faithful to the principles of disestablishment and general disendowment which we announced last year, and which we professed to our constituents ; and when he says that we have committed bribery he means that, in the application of those principles, we have studied carefully and to the best of our ability to ensure that there should be every mitigation and every softening which they could receive in their practical application. Therefore I accept the involuntary but most conclusive testimony given by my right hon. friend that the spirit in which we have proceeded, as one, among a variety of evidences afforded me by the demeanour of the House, that they think the Government has not failed in embodying in this important measure the main considerations which it was their duty to include in it.

I have nothing else to say which is essential or material. I wish to release this House ; and I will therefore conclude by thanking the House for the patience with which they have listened to me at this advanced hour of the night or of the morning, whichever we may think fit to call it. As the clock points rapidly towards the dawn, so we are rapidly flowing out the years, the months, the days, that remain to the existence of the Irish Established Church. An hon. Member last night assured us, speaking, I have no doubt, his own honest conviction, that we were but at the beginning of this question. I believe that not only every man who sits on this side of the House, but every man who sits on that, carries within his breast a silent monitor, which tells him that this controversy is fast moving to a close. It is for the interest of us all that we should not keep this Establishment of religion in a prolonged agony. Nothing can come from that prolongation but an increase of pain, an increase of exasperation, and a diminution of that temper which now happily prevails—a temper which is disposed to mitigate the adjustment of this great question in its details. There may also come from that prolongation the very evil which the right hon. gentleman opposite made it a charge against us that we were labouring to produce, but which we think likely to be rather the probable consequence of his line of argument—namely, the drawing into this Irish controversy that English question which we conceive to be wholly different. We think so, because, although in the two countries there may be and there are Establishments of religion, we never can admit that an Establishment which we think, in the main, good and efficient for its purposes, is to be regarded as being

endangered by the course which we may adopt in reference to an Establishment which we look upon as being inefficient and bad. The day, therefore, it seems to me, is rapidly approaching when this controversy will come to an end, and I feel that I am not wrong in appealing to that silent witness to the justice of my anticipations which I am satisfied exists on both sides of the House. Not now are we opening this great question. Opened, perhaps, it was, when the Parliament which expired last year pronounced upon it that emphatic judgment which can never be recalled. Opened it was, further, when in the months of autumn the discussions which were held in every quarter of the country turned mainly on the subject of the Irish Church. Prosecuted another stage it was, when the completed elections discovered to us a manifestation of the national verdict more emphatic than, with the rarest exceptions, has been witnessed during the whole of our Parliamentary history. The good cause was further advanced towards its triumphant issue when the silent acknowledgment of the late Government that they declined to contest the question was given by their retirement from Office, and their choosing a less responsible position from which to carry on a more desultory warfare against the policy which they had in the previous Session unsuccessfully attempted to resist. Another blow will soon be struck in the same good cause, and I will not intercept it one single moment more.

## SPEECH ON ADMINISTRATIVE ECONOMY AT BLACKHEATH

OCTOBER, 1871.

One of Gladstone's greatest oratorical efforts was his speech to his own constituents, when he was Prime Minister and Member for Greenwich, in the autumn of 1871. This speech was made under almost every possible disadvantage. It was delivered in the open air to a crowd of many thousand people, including a large hostile element. Greenwich then, for political purposes, comprised also Woolwich, where there was a good deal of discontent because Ministerial economy had led to the discharge of men from the dockyards. Gladstone's opening sentences were frequently interrupted. But he very soon succeeded in riveting the attention of his audience and held it for nearly two hours, while he justified the Government, and vindicated his own position as a trustee of national funds. He also dealt with the policy of the Government as a whole, and showed that since coming into office they had carried out a large number of the pledges given in opposition. It is a masterly defence, courageous and resolute, prudent and statesmanlike. Its special interest in an estimate of Gladstone's career is that it proved for the first time his power of moving and controlling large masses of men not less completely than he had so often swayed the House of Commons. He could appeal to the rapidly increasing prosperity of the country as evidence that our administrative system was sound. But the true secret of his triumph was that by the boldness and thoroughness of his reply to the charge made against him he satisfied the Englishman's sense of fair play.

**M**R. ANGERSTEIN and GENTLEMEN.—When I had the honour of addressing this constituency in the month of December, 1868, I endeavoured to state with frankness to you my consciousness of the peculiar disabilities under which I should labour, in the trust I had the honour to receive, with respect to the discharge of what I may call local duties towards you; and I stated that if you were pleased to return me to Parliament I could not but make almost unlimited demands upon your indulgence. Gentlemen, if I have not been amongst you since that period, at least it may be said with truth that I have not been idle. I have been engaged in the unintermitted endeavour to discharge the main and paramount portion of the duties you were pleased to place in my hands. But I was and am deeply sensible that, in thus consenting to forego much of

what was due to yourselves as a powerful and important community, you imposed upon me a debt of gratitude which it ought not only to be my pleasure to acknowledge, but which it ought to be the constant endeavour of my life to pay in something better than words—something better than local compliments—namely, in labour for the public good. And at least, gentlemen, this I can say, that if I have not been able to render to you the tokens of respect which are your due, I have never gone off my path for the purpose of visiting any other place. This is the first occasion since the general election upon which, by my own option and will, and without the friendly urgency which on two occasions availed itself of my presence for other purposes in the North—this is the first occasion that I have, by my own choice, visited and addressed an assembly of my fellow-countrymen. And, gentlemen, now that I have come, and now that, by gathering in these enormous numbers, you have testified your interest in the subject of our meeting, I am painfully oppressed with the consciousness that, however great may be your patience, and however kind your attention, neither your time nor my own physical strength can possibly enable me to do any justice to the subjects that are before me, or to render anything like an adequate account of my stewardship. I repeat, then, that I must trespass on your indulgence, and beg you to believe that if I touch but lightly, or even pass over altogether, many topics of public importance, it is not because I am insensible of their weight, but it is on account of the restrictions imposed by the physical conditions under which I address you.

Of your local interests, gentlemen, strictly so called, I will now say but one word, because it refers to a point at which, as a matter of fact, they touch upon a national subject. I mean with respect to the noble hospital at Greenwich. I had the honour of stating to an important deputation of your townsmen, formed without any distinction of political opinions, the views with which Her Majesty's Government would approach the consideration of the questions connected with that truly national building. Since that time the matter has had the careful attention of my right honourable friend the First Lord of the Admiralty ; and I am sanguine in the belief that, when his plans are matured, you will find that it will be, as I hope, in our power to apply the hospital to a purpose which will be satisfactory to you and to the country. Nor do I despair even of this, that it may be a purpose—though it would be premature to express a positive

opinion—that it may also be a purpose, which will revive and renew the traditions of the glorious profession with which, from the first, it has been connected.

I am not about to spend a large portion of your time in discussing exclusively the questions connected with the late session of Parliament. They have been largely debated, or largely considered, before many assemblages of Englishmen during the recess, and I rejoice that the public mind has been actively given to considering the history of that session, because the result has been to dispel entirely the delusion of those who suppose that, because it had been a session distinguished, unhappily, by peculiarities in the method of offering parliamentary opposition, it had, therefore, been an unproductive session. Of all the charges that were brought against the Government the principal one that will remain is this, that they laid upon the tables of Parliament too great a number of measures. Well, now, gentlemen, I wish upon that charge to make one observation. It is not exclusively in the option of Government to determine what measures it shall lay upon the tables of Parliament. It is true that formally that matter lies within their choice; but the influences that act upon them, both from within the Houses of Parliament and from the public expectation of the country, frequently—aye, constantly—make it a matter of moral necessity for them, even while they themselves may regret it, to produce to Parliament a greater number of measures than they can confidently reckon upon carrying into law. Now, there were four measures which we placed upon the table of the House of Commons that did not become law. I mean four measures of special importance, to which in this criticism special reference is made. And what were they? One of them was the Scotch Education Bill, another was the Licensing Bill, a third the Local Government Taxation Bill, and the fourth was the Mines Regulation Bill. (*A Voice*—"What about the Ballot?") I would venture to say to my friend that it is in his power, if he thinks fit, to inflict great inconvenience upon his neighbours, by making it difficult for them to hear me. It is for him to consider the propriety of that proceeding. Now, I am not about to argue whether we ought to have made greater progress with those four measures; but what I am about to state is this, that such was the state of public expectation and demand with regard to every one of those subjects, that it was not in our choice to refuse to place our views before Parliament in the form of a bill laid upon the table; and I believe

I am within the mark in saying that if we had attempted to avoid incurring that responsibility, either other members of Parliament would themselves have endeavoured to procure—not legislation upon the subject, but at least the production of measures of their own, for legislation was impossible ; or even it would have happened that the House of Commons, by a resolution, would have declared its opinion that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to produce to Parliament measures for the purpose of dealing with those questions.

It is often said, gentlemen, that the present Government have had a very easy task, because they have been supported by a large majority ; and inferences are drawn perhaps, by some of my friends in a knot of a score of persons over in that quarter (*alluding to individuals in the distance*), to the effect that our intellectual capacity must be very narrow indeed, inasmuch as we have experienced difficulties in doing what we wished to do while we had this immense Liberal majority at our backs. Now let us consider this matter.

There is a delusion in the public mind upon the subject ; and perhaps you will be surprised when, not dealing with argument, but with fact, I inform you that we are the first Liberal Government which as yet has subsisted for three years with a large majority. In my time there have been only three Liberal Governments with large majorities. One of them was the Government of Lord Grey, which had an enormous majority returned to support it in the month of December, 1832. It survived the year 1833 ; but in May, 1834, it was broken by schism ; in June, 1834, Lord Grey was put out, and in November, 1834, that Government was finally extinguished. The next Liberal Government which had a large majority was the Government of Lord Palmerston, in the year 1857, when he appealed to the country, and the country returned a majority of about eighty to support him. That was in the month of May, 1857. In the month of February, 1858, the Government of Lord Palmerston was displaced by a vote of the House of Commons. In 1866 the Government of Lord Russell met Parliament with another large majority—a majority of seventy ; and before the end of that session the Government of Lord Russell came to be counted with the things that were. Now, gentlemen, I think that I have made good my assertion—I hope, without any offence to anybody, the most susceptible of my hearers—that we are the first Liberal Government that has been returned to Parliament since the Reform Bill

with a large majority which has survived the operations of three sessions. And yet we are here, in old English phrase, "alive and kicking." I believe there is pith in us yet; and the speech I make to you to-day is not a last dying speech and confession. Gentlemen, I shall not make a party speech in the sense of wilfully offending opponents. To defend is part of my duty. But I shall endeavour carefully to observe that just regard for the feelings, at any rate, of all portions of my constituents, which, I think, is the duty of every Member of Parliament when he meets them assembled, without distinction and without restraint, under the open sky of heaven. But, further than as I have now described, I do not mean to adopt an apologetic tone. I do not mean to promise that we can or shall in the future be other than we have been in the past. I mean to endeavour to place before you, as a fair sample of the people of England, I will not say my own case personally, but the case, as far as I can, also of my colleagues. Moreover, in passing, I will say that as no Minister ever had the honour of serving a Sovereign more august or more beloved, so no Minister ever had cause to feel deeper gratitude to a body of able, devoted, and harmonious colleagues. It is now more than 200 years ago when a Minister of iron will and of great mental powers, Lord Strafford, in apologizing for himself to his fellow countrymen, told them that the work of government was such that indulgence must be applied to its critical examination. If this was true at that period, much more is it true now, when all civil and social wants have undergone such an immense development, and when political responsibility has assumed forms entirely new. But, except as to such apology, I am here respectfully and firmly to defend the course which has been taken by the Government.

When I had the honour of receiving my Parliamentary mission at your hands, there were two subjects which were prominently placed before you, and which constituted, in fact, what is popularly called the programme of the Government. The first and the greatest of these related to Ireland, with respect to which you will recollect that the venom of political discontent had shortly before been so active and so powerful that even in and from London you saw alarm pervade the whole community. You saw violence attack one of the public gaols; and in Manchester you saw murder, the fruit of Irish discontent, stalking in the streets. I am not going to dwell in detail on the manner in which Parliament has dealt with this great and paramount portion of the mission of the Government; with the subject on which it

was that we had defeated our opponents, and for the sake of dealing with which it was that we took office. But this I will say, that I believe that the community of Ireland is well satisfied with the measures which obtained the sanction of the Legislature, and that in Ireland there have been laid, for no very distant future, the foundations of solid political content. It would be premature to anticipate too confidently the ultimate results ; but I feel justified in saying that of all that I addressed to you on this great matter in December, 1868, I recollect no part or portion which it is needful for me to qualify or retract. In the face of the three countries, aye in the eye of all civilized mankind, the Legislature has made a great effort to do justice ; and all that takes place from day to day leads me to the confident expectation that that effort will be crowned with success.

But, gentlemen, there was another subject—the subject of economy in the public expenditure—upon which also I addressed to you words I believe sufficiently significant, and as this is a question of ever-recurring daily interest, I must advert to the charges that have been made against the Government with respect to it. It has been said, and said with confidence, that we have practised economy with gross inequality and partiality, that we have dismissed clerks, that we have dismissed dockyard labourers—and that, when we have had the opportunity, we have refused to touch the sinecurist or the official functionary of a higher position. Now, with respect to the dismissal of dockyard labourers it is necessary that I should say a few words ; and the facts which I mean to communicate to you may, perhaps, cause some astonishment, because you are aware that, if you trust to the representations of speakers or journals of a certain class, this dismissal of dockyard labourers, first of all, is a crime, and, secondly, is a crime that has been committed by the present Government alone. I will give you, in a concise form, the particulars. But, in the first place, let me say that, in my opinion, the closing or the restriction of Government establishments, so far from being a crime, may be a duty to the nation, and has been recognized as such duty by both parties when they have been in office. That it is a serious misfortune to many of those whom it affects I am the first to assert ; but the true inference to be drawn from that is, not that men are to be kept in idleness at the expense of the nation, nor that useless work is to be created in order to employ them ; but this, that the original creation of Government establishments, and that every extension of Govern-

ment establishments, ought to be watched with the utmost jealousy, and ought never to be allowed except under clear and stringent necessity. As to the number of dockyard labourers—now listen to these figures, for they are worth hearing. The number of dockyard labourers employed on the 1st of January, 1868, was 20,313. On the 1st of December, 1868, which was the day before I received my summons to the presence of Her Majesty at Windsor, that number of 20,313 had been reduced to 15,954. The difference, showing the reduction since the beginning of the year, was 4,359. The number of dockyard labourers which we found, therefore, was as I have told you, when we came into office ; more exactly, it was 15,974, and the number on the 1st of October last, which is the latest return I can give you, was 14,511. The result of that statement is that the reduction since we came into office has been 1,463. The reduction before we came into office was 4,359—so that just three-fourths of the whole reduction of which you now hear so much was not our work, but the work of our predecessors. But, gentlemen, as I have told you, this work was a work not undertaken either by them or by us upon our own arbitrary choice. A plan devised by a former Government, and sanctioned by a Committee of the House of Commons on the application of that Government, was the plan which both the present and the late Administration carried into effect. The Administration, in conformity with that plan, closed Deptford Dockyard on the 31st March, 1869 ; but they closed it under the decision of the Board of Admiralty belonging to the late Government. The Woolwich Dockyard was closed by the decision of the Board belonging to the present Government ; but both were closed in consequence, as I have said, of a plan proposed by a former Government to the House of Commons, and accepted by a former Parliament ; and it had become little less than a pledge of honour to Parliament and the country that that plan should be carried into effect.

It is said that we have never touched offices of a higher class. Gentlemen, I will speak for myself—and I only speak for myself, because I am thus, of course, more strictly responsible for the accuracy of what I state. Within a few weeks after the formation of the Government one of the most eligible pieces of patronage as patronage is understood, fell vacant by the death of a Commissioner of Excise, or rather a Commissioner of Inland Revenue, with a salary of £1,200 a year. Those who are interested in the matter may ascertain it by reference to the records of the time.

I need not even mention the name of the commissioner. It was reported to me that the maintenance of that office was unnecessary ; and I immediately directed that it should be abolished. The next eligible piece of patronage that offered itself to me—and you will understand the difference between offices of patronage and those offices of hard work which must be filled from a fixed and narrow circle of eligible persons—the next was a commissionership of the Board of Customs. With respect to that office, it was reported to me that it ought not to be abolished. But there was another office in the same department—the office of Receiver—with the same salary of £1,200 a year, that might be abolished ; and the course we took was this—we transferred the Receiver to the commissionership, and we abolished the office of the Receiver. I will not trouble you with details ; but I meet with an indignant denial, and I meet with a confident, if not a contemptuous, challenge, the declaration of those who say that we have spared our own patronage while we have dismissed clerks and workmen. It has been our happy lot in almost every department of the State—I believe there are but two exceptions—to give up that which has always been considered the special patronage, and a most highly-prized patronage of Governments—namely, the first appointments of clerks to the public offices. We have abandoned that power—we have thrown every one of them open to public competition. The transfer is now nearly complete ; and when it takes full effect, I can say that, as to the clerkships in my office—the office of the Treasury, and in nearly every other—every one of you has just as much power over their disposal as I have.

Well, so much for inequality with regard to our economy. But it is further said that our economies have been so injudicious that they have resulted in increased military and naval charge. Well, that is a simple error on the part of those who assert it. I will trouble you with no details ; the figures are public figures ; why it is that our figures have now again become so high, perhaps I may say presently ; but even at this moment, when we have just charged upon the country a large sum for the abolition of purchase in the army, our military and naval expenditure is still nearly £300,000 below the point at which we found it, though Europe has been convulsed and disturbed, and though we were obliged to give up altogether the notion of adhering, under circumstances so extraordinary, to the simple peace establishments of the country. But besides that, it is said that even our peace

establishments had suffered in efficiency. Now, I make this assertion—which we are ready to maintain, and that we have successfully maintained, whenever the charge has been made in our hearing—that we reduced the scale of estimates that our predecessors had adopted—two millions in the first year, and two millions in the second year, though we have since been compelled by the war in Europe to retrace, to a great extent, our steps. But, instead of purchasing that reduction by inefficiency, we had combined it with increased efficiency. We modified, and restrained, the system under which had been maintained to the present time a practice which may formerly have been reasonable, but which had now become a superstition—the practice by which the ships of England were scattered all over the world, whether they were wanted or whether they were not wanted. We reduced the wanton and useless expenditure which was incurred in that manner, and at the same time we did not reduce, but took effectual measures to strengthen, the real force of the country at home in powerful fleets, available, if need be, at any moment, for the defence of our shores. So it was with respect to the army. We did not purchase economy by the sacrifice of efficiency; we obtained increased efficiency together with economy, and that in two particular modes: the one was by endeavouring, as we are now endeavouring, with every hope of success, to give extension and efficacy to that system of army reserves, which had been until our time a dead letter, and which is but just beginning to expand, but to which the enlightened opinion of the country looks as the most likely means of affording you a first-rate army without an outrageous extent of expenditure; and, further, we likewise proceeded to withdraw our troops from colonies which did not want them, or in which they were useless. We withdrew in various cases—particularly from New Zealand and Canada—troops from colonies which became available for the defence of England; and even while we were presenting reduced estimates we were able to show that within the limits of the three kingdoms we had an increase of the force at home prepared to maintain the honour of the country.

I now pass on from the subject of the promises that I made to you in 1868; because I am not aware that there was any other question of very great consequence upon which, at that time, it was my duty materially to dilate. But we have gone on from these to other subjects; and what have they been? They have been three—three, I mean, which I place in the first

order of magnitude. One of them is the abolition of purchase in the army, one of them is the education of the people—and one of them is the protection of the voter by the ballot. Well, now, first in attacking purchase in the army, we were perfectly well aware that we were assailing class interest in its favourite and most formidable stronghold, and I rejoice to think that in a single session we have been able to achieve a work so formidable. It is indeed achieved at a great cost ; because, when the people of England set about political reforms they never accomplish them in a niggardly spirit, but their practice is to make generous compensations to those who may have suffered, aye sometimes even to those who only may imagine themselves to suffer, by them ; and in every doubtful case to adopt the liberal course of action. But what is the real case of the British army ? The public has been practised upon by writers who seem to find a kind of luxury in panic and alarm ; and who endeavour to propagate these feelings throughout the country not without success ; although, for my part, I regard them with rather less of charity—I do not mean the people, but the endeavours—with rather less of goodwill and sympathy, than I should regard the propagation of the small-pox or the cattle plague. You have always had in this country, both as to officers and as to men, an army of the noblest and the very best material. Allow me to give you a short anecdote, to vary the wearisomeness of my discourse. I daresay many of you have heard the name of Bewick, who was a famous woodcutter—an artist of great celebrity, a northern man. He lived, I think, in the time of the American War. Besides his woodcutting, he determined that, as it was a time of danger, and he had an English heart in his bosom, he would learn a little soldiering. So he and two or three of his friends sent for the drill sergeant, and the drill sergeant put them through their exercise, but he only troubled them with one precept, and it was this, “ Now mind, my lads, what you have to do is this : When you go into action, you must stand like a brick wall.” And that has been the great quality of the British soldier—that under all circumstances he has been ready to stand, and has stood, “ like a brick wall.” And there was a time when standing “ like a brick wall ” was almost enough to win a battle. It will not do now. War, instead of being a rude test of strength, has become one of the most highly developed of all the arts practised by mankind. I know not whether to regret it or to rejoice at it ; I simply state the fact that, instead of trusting simply to the native and sterling qualities

of the people, we must now endeavour to add to these qualities every advantage that can be imparted by the most skilful and effectual training.

With a view to this training—not merely of the men, where it is comparatively simple, but of the officers, who, even more than the men, are the strength of the army, and the essential condition of its efficiency—we have asked the country to pay a large sum of money. The country has met the call with cheerfulness, and has witnessed with satisfaction the downfall of a great monopoly. And, gentlemen, with respect to our alarmists, what have we lately seen? For the first time, at least the first upon such a scale and under such conditions, we have made a very great step in advance, by endeavouring to put a portion of our forces into mimic action upon the open lands of Hampshire. The performances of those troops have been witnessed by most enlightened and distinguished foreign officers from every great country in Europe. We were told at the end of the session, and told by an ex-Minister, whose words would naturally carry force with his countrymen, that we had an army that could not march; and a gallant colonel rose in the house (*A Voice*: “One of your own party!”)—if so, all the better for the purpose, but he was an opponent—a gallant colonel told the House of Commons, that he felt obliged to break through the rules of its procedure in order to raise a discussion upon the question of the manœuvres, for he said such was the course of the Government, that it was a question not merely of the well-being, but of the very existence of the British army. This was the condition to which we were reduced. Well, now, gentlemen, we have had time to receive back from foreign courts the most interesting reports made to their respective Governments by those distinguished officers; and I am rejoiced to inform you that their character is of the most encouraging description. Not only in every case do they declare a warm admiration—I will not say an unbounded admiration, in order that I may avoid anything like hyperbole—for the material of both our officers and our men; but of the various branches of the service, as to their efficiency, they speak in terms of the highest honour; and while as friendly critics they point out, as we knew they would point out, and as we hoped they would point out, many matters upon which we need and may endeavour to improve, they show that the condition of the army, so far from justifying the ridiculous apprehensions that have gone abroad, is one that ought to fill all Englishmen with hope and satisfaction,

and to prove to us that never were our establishments more efficient ; never were we more able, if it should please Providence to bring upon us the necessity, to entrust its defence to troops and to officers worthy of their country, and qualified to make the defence effectual. And now let me say one word with respect to the War Minister. It has been the fashion during the present year to scoff at Mr. Cardwell. I can only say that when he is condemned I, for my part, am glad to share the condemnation. But I venture to affirm that no man, who has held the seals of office since the Secretaryship of War was established, has done so much for the reform and efficiency of the army ; and I am quite sure that when he retires from that office, he will leave behind him a name entitled to the approval and the gratitude of the country. There, gentlemen, is our justification, summarily stated, for dealing with the question of purchase. I press on to other matters.

Were we wrong in dealing with the question of education ? (" No, no.") Very well. Has there ever been, I would next venture to say to the most jealous critic of the Education Act—has there ever been achieved in this country so great a step in advance towards the attainment of an object which we believe to be vital to the welfare of the nation ? It is not all done at once—it cannot be all done at once. A measure so great and comprehensive, and at the same time so novel, cannot be perfect. The differences of opinion that prevail in this free country make it quite impossible to meet the views of all. Indulgence, equity, the sacrifice of extreme opinions, must be asked for in every quarter. But I ask those who are least satisfied with the Education Act this one and simple question—Whether it is not a great step, nay, a great stride, achieved upon the path of real progress ? The objects of that measure shall be very shortly stated. The great object of all was to make education universal and effective. This was to be done, and in doing it we sought, and I think reason and common sense required us to seek, to turn to account for that purpose the vast machinery of education already existing in the country, which had been devised and mainly provided by the Christian philanthropy and the voluntary action of the people. That was the second condition under which the Act was framed. The third was, and I think it was not less wise than the two former, that we should endeavour to separate the action of the State in the matter of education, and the application of State funds, in which I include funds raised by rate, from all subjects on which,

unhappily, religious differences prevail. Those, I may say, were three of the principles of the measure ; and the fourth principle, not less important than the others, was this : that we should trust for the attainment of these great objects, as little as possible to the central Government, and as much as possible to the local authorities and the self-governing power of the people. And let me say in passing, that in my opinion if there be one portion of our institutions more precious in my view than another, it is that portion in which the people are locally organized for the purposes of acquiring the habits and instincts of political action, and applying their own free consciences and free understandings to dealing with the affairs of the community. A most valuable Act was passed by Mr. Stansfeld in the last Session of Parliament which, I trust, will be the beginning of immense good in that respect, and I refer to it here because it touches upon the principle of the Education Act, which I have just mentioned, viz., that as far as possible the application of the Act should be left in the hands of the local authorities. I am not surprised nor disappointed, and I hope that you are neither the one nor the other, if we find that some difficulties have arisen in working out the details of the Act. (Mr. Gladstone paused here to refresh his voice from a small bottle of restoratives. As he did so, a voice in the crowd was heard exclaiming, " Give us some," to which the right hon. gentleman rejoined, amidst much laughter, " Yes, you would want some if you had to do what I have.") The right hon. gentleman continued :—

Great interest has been excited, both in this and in other constituencies, with respect to the payment of fees to denominational schools for the teaching of those children whose parents are found to be unable to bear the charge of their education. Now, perhaps, it will be a comfort to you to know that at least there is some hope that the extent of this particular grievance and difficulty may not be very wide. In the town of Stockport the Education Board has lately resolved to introduce the principle of compulsion, which, as I have stated, or as I have implied, was one of the principles of the Education Act. They have, by issuing their notices to that effect, added 25 per cent. to the number of children attending schools. In 400 cases they have had to admonish parents, and to warn them that they would be punished unless they complied with the Act ; but the whole amount of money—although there are as yet no rate-schools in action, and they have been obliged to allow all children to be sent to deno-

minational schools—which they have as yet paid to these schools in aid of poor parents comes only to £47. But, gentlemen, I have no doubt that this question is a grave and serious question, and I will not attempt to say more upon it than this: On the one hand we shall endeavour to adhere to that principle of the Act which aims at severance between the application of State funds and controverted matters in religion. On the other hand I must pause for my own part, and I believe my colleagues would feel themselves obliged to pause before they could resolve to say to the parent who desires to send his child to a school of his own persuasion, but is unable to pay the charge, and who is compelled by public authority to send it to some school, “If you attempt to send your child to a school of your own persuasion, if you will not send it to a school of the principles of which you disapprove—namely, to a rate-school,—we will send you to prison.” I do not believe public opinion would sustain us in such a course as that.

Well, gentlemen, with regard to the remaining one of these great subjects—namely, the Ballot,—I will only say we believe it to be your opinion that we have made a good and wise choice in pressing that important question on the attention of Parliament. The enfranchisement, the wide enfranchisement of the working classes, was intended to give the boon of political power not only to the class, but to every individual in the class. We have, therefore, to secure in the case of these persons, many of them to a considerable extent from their temporal circumstances dependent upon others, that the vote which we invite them to give shall be given freely—freely as respects landlord, freely as respects customer, freely as respects employer, freely as respects combination of the working-class itself; and I rejoice to think, gentlemen, that, although the Royal Assent has not yet been given to a bill for secret voting, yet for every practical purpose, after the proceedings of last Session, the question has very nearly reached the stage of final triumph.

I will now, gentlemen, for the present assume that, as regards the class of greater subjects, on which I had the honour of addressing you at the time of my election, and as regards those greater questions to which we have invited Parliament principally to apply itself, you may be disposed to think we have not made an unreasonable or injudicious selection, although we had to choose from among many matters of deep interest and importance.

I will now say a word or two as to the future. I will allude

to one measure in particular, or rather one set of measures, relating to a painful subject, on which I cannot here enter into detail. I mean those measures which are known by the name of the Contagious Diseases Acts. I can only assure you that they have received the closest attention of the Government, and that we shall be ready, when the Session arrives, in due course, to state our views, and that I believe then it will be found to be your opinion that we have not fallen short in the care and interest which the subject demands ; that we have not concealed from ourselves the difficulties that beset it ; and that the modes in which we may propose to deal with it are likely to command the general approval of the intelligent community.

The great questions, gentlemen, to which I have lately referred have caused us, in a considerable degree, to put aside another class of questions upon which the heart and mind of the country are strongly set. If I may describe them by a single phrase, I should be disposed to describe them negatively as subjects of non-political legislation. What relates to health and the well-being of life, to the good order and comfort of the community, to the reasonable supplies of those necessities of air, water, and the like, wherein the action of public authority is almost of necessity involved—these and many other matters all fall within that interesting class. Depend upon it, you will never find a Government that is not of itself disposed to give its attention as early as possible, and as much as possible, to questions of that description. And I will tell you why. First of all we may hope that every Government would be actuated by those motives and feelings of philanthropy and humanity, which dictate a sedulous attention to those subjects. But if I am to look to narrower and more selfish motives, none can be so interested in giving prominence to that class of topics as a Government itself ; because they are removed from the sphere of party ; because, while we are dealing with them, the existence of the Government is hardly in question ; because, instead of a constant and daily strife, you have, upon the whole, concord and harmony between the two sides of the House. And I must say it would be totally contrary to the laws and impulses of human nature, if a Government were not pleased with that state of things, and with that description of employment, rather than with being involved in controversies properly political, in which its existence is incessantly at stake. Of course these subjects do not admit of lengthened development upon occasion such as the present ; but the reason why I have dwelt

at length upon the great matters on which we have endeavoured to employ the time of Parliament was in order that you might see that, if little had been achieved upon those important and non-political questions, it was not for slight cause, but it was because we had been compelled by overwhelming motives of public duty to give the first place to the great national overruling subjects on which I have for so long a time detained you.

There is a question of the future on which we have heard much said of late—I mean the question of the constitution of the House of Lords. (*A Voice* : “ You had better leave that alone.”) My friend there says, “ Leave the constitution of the House of Lords alone.” I am not prepared quite to agree with my friend, because the constitution of the House of Lords has often been a subject of consideration among the wisest and the most sober-minded men ; as, for example, when a proposal—of which my friend disapproves apparently—was made, a few years ago, to make a moderate addition to the House of Lords, of peers holding peerages for life. I am not going to discuss that particular measure ; but I will only say, without entering into details that would be highly interesting, but which the vast range of those subjects makes impossible on the present occasion—I will only say that I believe there are various particulars in which the constitution of the House of Lords might, under favourable circumstances, be improved. And I am bound to say that, though I believe there are some politicians, bearing the name of “ Liberal,” who approve of the proceedings of the House of Lords with respect to the Ballot Bill at the close of the last Session—I see a gentleman disposed to differ from me, and I have no doubt that his opinion is entitled to the greatest weight : if he likes to address this assemblage, I daresay they will be delighted to hear him, but, if I do not stand in his way, perhaps he will allow me to go on—I must own that I deeply lament that proceeding on the part of the House of Lords. It seems to me to have been a great error. After the House of Commons, which had been engaged in other and most serious labours for four or five months, had given some six weeks of the Session—six weeks of very arduous labour—mainly to maturing the Ballot Bill, it appears to me to have been a great and grievous error, I cannot call it anything less, on the part of the House of Lords, in the second week in the month of August, to say that really such was the time at which they had arrived as to render it impossible for them to afford to that measure the number of days—not a very large number of days, according

to all precedent and likelihood—that it would have required from them. In the year 1835, the House of Lords, which had a Conservative majority in the face of a Whig Government, not only devoted the month of August, but carried into September the labour necessary for a subject not more important than the Ballot, and at that epoch a subject which had come prominently before the public for the first time—I mean the subject of municipal corporations. But the House of Lords at that juncture was led by a great man. The Conservative majority was guided by the Duke of Wellington; and, although, for my own part, I am not able, in all its parts, to admire the statesmanship of the Duke of Wellington, I shall always profoundly admire the tact, and the skill, and the sound constitutional judgment with which he managed the House of Lords, so as to prevent that particular branch of the Legislature from being placed in dangerous conflict with the popular branch or with the sentiment of the country. But the reform of the House of Lords, which has been recommended in many quarters, is briefly this,—and here I think I am coming to a point of probable agreement with my hon. friend, if he will allow me so to call him. The reform recommended is this—that we should eject and expel from the House of Lords what is termed the hereditary principle. Now, gentlemen, I hope I am at least earnest and sincere in my intentions as to being what passes for a Liberal politician; but before I agree, and before I commit myself to expelling from the House of Lords the hereditary principle, I will think once, I will think twice—nay, I will even think thrice. It is not on account of this or that particular error committed by a public assembly that we are vitally or profoundly to change the established and accustomed usages and principles of the Constitution. Mark what has since happened. Lord Shaftesbury, whom I mention with a profound respect on account of his earnest and devoted philanthropy, went the other day down to Glasgow, and he received a most warm welcome on the part of the vast population of that city—the working population of that city. In consequence of that incident, some politicians threw up their hats, and exclaimed that the people of Glasgow approved of Lord Shaftesbury's motion with regard to the Ballot Bill. I think that was a precipitate conclusion. But this I conceive was shown by his reception—that the people of Glasgow, being a sagacious people, were not disposed, on account of that particular error, to draw rapid and precipitate conclusions, either against a man or against a body which had performed

distinguished services. I will ask you two things ; this is a question of so much interest to all, that even after the length to which I have necessarily been drawn, I beg your attention to two points on this portion of our subject. Before you determine to expel the hereditary principle from the House of Lords, I first ask you, the people of Greenwich, as representing the people of England, what you will substitute for the hereditary principle ? (*A Voice*—"Five years' election.") That is a fruitful hint, but yet I have another point to suggest, and it is this : I have a shrewd suspicion in my mind that a very large proportion of the people of England have a sneaking kindness for this hereditary principle.

I do not mean, gentlemen, by these words that a large proportion of the people of England either desire, or intend, or would permit that which I hope that they never will desire, or intend, or permit—namely, that the House of Lords should exercise a paramount control over the legislation of the country. That is quite another matter. But this I do say—that the people of England are not, like the people of France, lovers of naked political equality. England is a great lover of liberty ; but of equality she never has been so much enamoured. Gentlemen, in judging of this question, I must say that possibly the observation of the manner in which, for such long periods, and under so many varieties of form, the love of equality in France has proved insufficient to save our generous and distinguished neighbours from the loss of liberty—the observation of these facts may tend to confirm the people of the three kingdoms in the feelings that I think they entertain ; but I want to put this to you as a practical question. The only mode of judging whether an Englishman—and I use the word "Englishman" for the people of the three kingdoms—is not unfriendly to social inequalities is by watching the working of our institutions in detail. My observation has not been of a very brief term—I wish it had been, for then I should have been younger than I am now—and it is this : that whenever there is anything to be done, or to be given, and there are two candidates for it who are exactly alike—alike in opinions, alike in characters, alike in possessions,—and one is a commoner and the other a lord, the Englishman is very apt indeed to prefer the lord. Once upon a time, about fifteen years ago, it was supposed that the Whig party was too aristocratic and exclusive. A popular combination of members of Parliament was formed for the purpose of practically protesting against this supposed exclu-

siveness. I do not think the charge was made good ; but that is immaterial. This body of respectable men organized their association ; and, after they had thus taken their ground for the purpose of making a practical protest, there came a petition from some rather important town in favour of the objects of the association. This petition, I think, was sent to some one who acted as secretary ; but at any rate the question arose among them who should present the petition on the part of the body. I believe there were about forty of these gentlemen ; but there was only one of them who was a lord, and these gentlemen determined that the lord should present the petition.

We have had another illustration—and a most amusing illustration—within the last few days. You have all of you heard of the Seven Points. I am not going to enter into the mysterious and mystical parts of this transaction, which I have no doubt is destined, under the action of time, which brings all things to light, to undergo further elucidation ; but there is one gentleman whose name there is no doubt about at all, for he is in the thick of it. I believe he is a very distinguished man ; he is Mr. Scott Russell. Mr. Scott Russell seems to have cast his eyes around, to have surveyed the whole circuit of the community, and to have thought that he had got a secret whereby the discords of class could be removed ; so he forms a body of working men, an organized body, considered or supposed in some degree or other, great or small, I do not know which, to represent the working men on one side ; and there is also, it seems, an organized body considered to represent the upper classes on the other side. So we have one body on this side, another body on that side, and in the middle Mr. Scott Russell. Mr. Scott Russell carries on communications with both of these bodies. He speaks first to the one and then to the other. You have seen a clergyman in a large church—when he gives out his text. He first looks here, and says to the people in that direction, It is written so and so, and in such a place you will find it. Then he looks there, and says the words again, In such a place you will find it. This is exactly, or almost exactly, what seems to have been done by Mr. Scott Russell ; the only difference is this—that unfortunately Mr. Scott Russell gave the text out of the New Testament to the people on this side, and the text out of the Old Testament to the people on that side. But the point I wish to call to your attention is the description—it is a very brief and clear one—given by Mr. Scott Russell to the working men of the nature and composition of the

body which he had brought to deal with them. He might have said, "I have brought together a body of educated, intelligent, able, independent men"; and perhaps that is what would have taken place in any other country: but, on the contrary, what was the language he used? He said—"I have organized a body," and what does it contain? "It contains, peers, lords, baronets, and one commoner." One solitary commoner among peers, lords, and baronets! Mr. Scott Russell must have known the dispositions of those whom he was addressing, and no doubt when he leant to this side of the congregation, he used the language which would be agreeable to its sympathies and feelings; and yet—so it fell—there was but one commoner in this illustrious body of titled persons, like a solitary non-commissioned officer preferred from the ranks to the mess-table. That is the kind of composition he prefers. It is by describing men as "peers, lords, and baronets" that he finds he will make his prescription more acceptable to those for whom it was intended. This is all full of meaning. I know there cannot be conclusive force in any one particular illustration with respect to a matter which can only be judged by a long course of observation. But this I do say, as my own conviction, that the general sentiment most prevailing in this country is that those who compose the House of Lords are men, or are the descendants of men, of whom a very large proportion are, or were in other times, put into that house for public services, and people are disposed to look with considerable favour upon such men, and likewise upon the descendants of such, until they have proved themselves unworthy. And they know that in effect, not by compulsion, but by the free will of the people, this body of gentlemen in the House of Lords exercise throughout the country a vast social and political influence; and lastly, that many of them—although the good ones have to carry, as it were, on their backs the dead weight and the responsibility of the bad—many of them perform their duties in an admirable and exemplary manner. Under these circumstances, gentlemen, though I hope I shall, while I remain in public life, be able to act zealously and cheerfully with you for the promotion of Liberal opinions, I, for one, have never understood by Liberal opinions either precipitate conclusions or subversive opinions. And I hope we shall well consider, before we commit ourselves to vast changes, to the introduction of new and far-reaching principles, what the results are likely to be.

Now, gentlemen, I am drawing very near to my close; but I

must still detain you while I refer to a sentiment, which undoubtedly has been more perceptible in the country during the present year, than I have noticed it in a good many former years. I mean a suspicion on the part of many members of the working class, that they are not governed as they ought to be, and that their interests are not properly considered. I will not enter upon the particular causes, connected with the uneasy state of Europe, which may go far to account for this sentiment ; but I will venture to say this, that I think the working man will do well briefly and calmly to review the history, with regard to himself, of the last eighteen years. I take that period—I might take a longer one—but I take that period because it enables me to present results in a tolerably simple form, and because it is a period within which I have been most intimately conversant with a multitude of questions, in which the welfare of the mass of the community is deeply and directly concerned. Within these eighteen years, what has taken place affecting all classes of the community, but especially, and more than all others, affecting the working classes of the people ? In the first place, perfectly free access has been given for the entry into our ports of everything that they can want from every quarter of the world—I mean perfectly free, whether as regards prohibitions or as regards protective duties. In the second place, we have seen remitted during those eighteen years an amount of taxation which I will not undertake—and which it is not necessary for me at this moment—to state minutely ; but I will venture to assert that the taxation upon commodities, which he has seen remitted within that period, is something between £15,000,000 and £20,000,000 sterling per annum. That remission of taxation, in which the working man is so especially interested, has not been purchased by an augmentation of the burdens upon other classes ; because the Income-tax, though it is higher now than I should like to see it—namely, at 6*d.* in the pound—is still one penny lower than it was eighteen years ago, before those fifteen millions of taxes were remitted. Within these eighteen years, his class has been invested largely with the Parliamentary franchise, and he now sees himself at the point where he may reasonably hope that, before he is six or eight months older, he will be protected in the free exercise of that franchise by means of the Ballot. The Parliament has passed an Act which aims at securing for all his children, under all circumstances, a good primary education, and which provides that, if unhappily he be unable himself to meet the cost, it shall be

defrayed for him by the State and by his wealthier neighbours. Whilst this provision has been made for primary education, endeavours have been made, through reforming the Universities, through the entire abolition of tests, and through an extensive dealing with the public and the grammar schools of the country, to establish the whole of our schools in a hierarchy of degrees—the several orders of education rising one above the other—so that, whenever there is in a child a capacity to rise, he may, with facility, pass on from point to point, and may find open to him the road through knowledge to distinction. But education would not be of great use to the people unless the materials of study were accessible ; and therefore, at no small cost of political effort, the material of paper has been set free of duty, and every restriction, in stamp or otherwise, upon the press has been removed. The consequence has been the creation of a popular press which, for the lowness of its price, for the general ability—aye, for the general wisdom and moderation with which it is written, and for the vast extent of its circulation, I might almost venture to call, not only an honour to the nation, but the wonder of the world. And in order that the public service might indeed be a public service—in order that we might not have among the civil offices of the State that which we had complained of in the army—namely, that the service was not the property of the nation, but of the officers, we have now been enabled to remove from the entry into the Civil Service the barriers of nomination, patronage, jobbing, favouritism in whatever form ; and every man belonging to the people of England—if he is able to fit his children for the purpose of competing for public employment—may do it entirely irrespective of the question of what is his condition in life, or the amount of means with which he may happen to be, or now to be endowed. I say confidently, in the face of those of the working community who may hear me, and to the minds of all those who may pay the least attention to these words through any other medium, that when, within such a period as I have described, measures like these have been achieved, while there may remain much to be done—I am the last to deny it, I am the first to assert it—there is reason to look with patience and indulgence upon a system under which such results have been accomplished ; some reason for that loyalty to the Throne, and that attachment to the law, which are the happy characteristics of the people of this country.

But while I would exhort you to impose upon the Government

and the Legislature every burden that they are, in their own nature, capable of bearing, in my mind they are not your friends, but in fact, though not in intention, your enemies, who teach you to look to the Legislature, or to the Government, for the radical removal of the evils which afflict human life. I read but a few days ago, in a questionable book, verses which I think contain much good sense, and which I will read to you :—

“ People throughout the land  
Join in one social band,  
And save yourselves.  
If you would happy be,  
Free from all slavery,  
Banish all knavery,  
And save yourselves.”

It is the individual mind, the individual conscience ; it is the individual character, on which mainly human happiness or human misery depends. The social problems which confront us are many and formidable. Let the Government labour to its uttermost, let the Legislature spend days and nights in your service ; but, after the very best has been achieved, the question whether the English father is to be the father of a happy family and the centre of a united home, is a question which must depend mainly upon himself. Those who propose to you schemes like those Seven Points of which I spoke—who promise to dwellers in towns that every one of them shall have a house and garden in the country—those who tell you that there shall be markets for selling, at wholesale price, retail quantities—I will not say, gentlemen, that these are impostors, because I have no doubt that they are sincere ; but I will say that they are quacks—they are misled and beguiled by a spurious philanthropy, and when they ought to give you substantial, even if humble and modest, boons, they are endeavouring, perhaps, without their own consciousness, to delude you with phantasms, and to offer you glowing fruit which, when you attempt to taste it, will prove to be but ashes in your mouth. No, gentlemen, what we have to ask ourselves are questions which it depends upon ourselves individually in the main to answer. How are the ravages of strong drink to be checked ? In an age when, from year to year, more and more women are becoming self-dependent members of the community, how, without tampering with the cardinal laws that determine providentially their position in the world, how are we to remove the serious social inequalities under which I, for one, hold that they labour ? How, in a country where wealth accumulates with

such vast rapidity, are we to check the growth of luxury and selfishness by sound and healthy opinion? How are we to secure to labour its due honour?—and I mean not only the labour of the hands, but the labour of the man, with any and with all the faculties that God has given him? How are we to make ourselves believe, and how are we to bring the country to believe, that in the sight of God and man labour in this world is honourable, and idleness is of all things most contemptible? Depend upon it I do but speak the serious and solemn truth when I say that, within and beneath the political questions that are found upon the surface, lie the deeper and more searching questions that enter into the breast, and that strike home to the conscience and the mind of every man; and it is upon the solution of these questions, and other questions such as these, that the well-being of England must depend.

Gentlemen, I use the words of a popular poet when I give vent to those sentiments of hope with which, for one, I venture to look forward to the future of the country. He says—

“ The ancient virtue is not dead,  
And long may it endure!  
May wealth in England ” . . .

(and I am sure he means by wealth the higher sense of it—prosperity alone, but healthful and sound prosperity)—

“ May wealth in England never fail,  
Nor pity for the poor.”

May strength and the means of material prosperity never be wanting to us! But it is far more important that there shall not be wanting the disposition to use those means aright. And now, gentlemen, I shall go home from this meeting, after having given you the best account in my feeble power, within the time and under the circumstances of the day, strengthened by the comfort of your kindness and your indulgence, to resume my share in public labours. And no motive will more operate upon me as an incentive to the discharge of duty than the gratitude with which I look back upon the, I believe, unexampled circumstances under which you chose me for your representative. But I shall endeavour and shall make it my special aim to show that gratitude less by words of sounding compliment or hollow flattery than by a manful struggle, according to the measure of my gifts, humble as they may be, to render service to a Queen who lives in the hearts of the people—and to a nation, with respect to which I

will say that through all posterity, whether it be praised or whether it be blamed, whether it be acquitted or whether it be condemned, it will be acquitted or condemned upon this issue—of having made a good or a bad use of the most splendid opportunities ; of having turned to account, or having failed to turn to account, the powers, the energies, the faculties which mark the people of this little island as among the small and select company of great nations that have stamped their name on the page of history as gifted with the qualities that mark the leaders of mankind.

## IRISH UNIVERSITY BILL

FEBRUARY 13, 1873

After the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869, and the passing of the first Irish Land Act in 1870, Gladstone took up the subject of the higher education in Ireland. The University of Dublin, otherwise known as Trinity College, was practically confined to members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who at that time were alone eligible to its scholarships and Fellowships. Few Roman Catholics ever entered it, and none of them attended the unsectarian Colleges of Belfast or Galway. In fact they were deprived of University education altogether. The difficulties of supplying the deficiency were very great. What the Roman Catholics of Ireland, especially their Bishops, wanted was a University of their own, denominational in character, and under clerical control. To such an institution the House of Commons would certainly not have voted a single penny, either from the taxes or from the Irish Church surplus. On the other hand, a University open to men of all creeds and of none, a University such as Oxford and Cambridge had recently become, would be quite unsatisfactory to nine Roman Catholics out of ten. Gladstone made an ingenious attempt to please all parties by proposing a University without religious tests, but with restrictions upon the teaching of philosophy and history which would relieve the fears of the Catholic parent. The attempt failed. English Liberals who disliked intensely the idea of directing knowledge or speculation combined with reactionary influence from Rome to defeat it. Although it was favourably received at first, the opposition to it steadily grew, and the second reading of the Bill was rejected by a majority of three. This speech was made just before the division. Gladstone dwelt earnestly upon the necessity of giving Irishmen who belonged, as a large majority of them did belong, to the Church of Rome, a form of education which they would accept, and of which they would approve. His plea for governing Ireland according to Irish ideas is urged with persuasive, almost pathetic, eloquence. But it was many years before his plans were substantially carried out, and the only result of them at the time was a simple measure, carried by a private member after the loss of the Ministerial Bill, which put the University of Dublin on the same open and secular footing as the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

**M**R. GLADSTONE, in rising to move that the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill for the extension of University Education in Ireland, said: Mr. Bonham-Carter, I rise, Sir, for the third time since the formation of the present Government, to submit to the House in detail proposals respecting

Irish affairs, in regard to which I say little in stating that they are vital to the honour and existence of the Government ; but of which I may say also that which is of greater importance—that they are vital to the prosperity and welfare of Ireland. For even if we think that University education is a matter less directly connected with the peace and happiness of the country than others on which we have formerly been called upon more than once to proceed, it must be borne in mind that when we look into the far future the well-being of Ireland must in a great degree depend on the moral and intellectual culture of her people ; and that in the promotion of that culture the efficiency of her Universities cannot fail to be a most powerful and effectual instrument. There are, indeed, those who think, and those who say, that Ireland is a barren field on which to spend the efforts of Parliament, and that the more we endeavour to improve its condition the less return is made for our philanthropic labours. In that discouraging opinion the Government, however, do not concur. The state of Ireland at the present moment does not deter us from asking Parliament steadily to prosecute that course on which it has long ago entered. I will not, when I have so much of necessary exposition before me, trouble the House with details on a subject that is only germane to the matter immediately in hand and that does not strictly belong to its essence ; but I may say, with respect to the condition of Ireland, that industry is flourishing, and that according to all appearances—all well-known and ordinary appearances—the best description of wealth in that country, the wealth of the community at large, rapidly increases ; that order is respected, that ordinary crime is less than in England ; that agrarian crime has greatly diminished ; and, as it has often been observed, and observed with truth, that when agrarian crime diminishes in Ireland, for the most part political and treasonable crime increases, I may state with thankful satisfaction that in 1871 treasonable offences in Ireland had sunk to the low number of seven only, and that in 1872 there was not one treasonable offence.

I must again, as on former occasions, ask for the indulgence of the House, for I have to enter on a subject of great difficulty, great intricacy, and great complexity of detail ; and it is only by means of that indulgence that I can hope in any degree to succeed in conveying to the mind of the House a clear conception either of the subject itself or of the intentions and proposals of the Government. There is another plea, which if it were needed, I

would offer, but which I know is hardly needed—namely, the plea for that favourable and candid consideration which in 1869 and 1870 we so largely experienced; which enabled us at those epochs to encounter the difficulties we had then to meet, and which, I believe, will now again be granted, and will again enable us to encounter the difficulties with which we now have to deal. There is, Sir, a subject of great importance, collateral to that immediately in hand, to which I will only refer for the sake of putting it aside; it is that which relates to the intermediate or proprietary schools in Ireland. It has lately been represented to me, with a singular and gratifying concurrence of opinion, from every quarter representing influence and intelligence in a particular county in Ireland—I mean the county of Limerick—that the greatest necessity exists for legislation with regard to the higher or preparatory schools of that country. I am quite sensible that is the case; but I am equally convinced that it is impossible for us advantageously to endeavour to mix legislation for the intermediate schools of Ireland with legislation in regard to her Universities. What I wish for the present to state is, our free admission that legislation with regard to its higher or preparatory schools, or, at least, the question how far it may be possible to legislate with regard to its schools, must arise as a necessary consequence of the legislation which Parliament may think fit to adopt with respect to the question of University education. I wish further to point out that the course which Parliament may take, and the principles which it may adopt for its own guidance, with respect to University education will be of the utmost advantage to any Government that may have to frame a measure with regard to the higher or preparatory schools of Ireland. Admitting, therefore, the importance, and even the urgency, of the subject, I trust I shall be favourably understood when I say that we think it absolutely necessary to keep it apart from the intricate and difficult question of University education with which we have at present to deal.

In approaching, Sir, the consideration of the question, it is impossible altogether to put out of view the flow of criticism with respect to the subject itself, and with respect to the intentions and conduct of the Government, which have for some time been almost incessantly brought under the public eye. We have heard much, Sir, of Ultramontane influence—(“Hear, hear!”)—and it may be well, therefore—that cheer is an additional reason why I should notice the point—to refer to it for a moment. I cannot

wonder that apprehensions with respect to Ultramontane influence should enter into the minds of the British public whenever legislation affecting the position of the Roman Catholics in Ireland is projected ; and we cannot, I think, be surprised that the influences which appear so forcibly to prevail within the Roman communion should be regarded by a very great portion of the people of this country with aversion, and by some portion of them even with unnecessary dread. It appears to us, however, that we have one course, and one course only to take, one decision, and one only to arrive at, with respect to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. Do we intend, or do we not intend, to extend to them the full benefit of civil equality on a footing exactly the same as that on which it is granted to members of other religious persuasions ? If we do not, the conclusion is a most grave one ; but if the House be of opinion, as the Government are of opinion, that it is neither generous nor politic, whatever we may think of this ecclesiastical influence within the Roman Church, to draw distinctions in matters purely civil adverse to our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen—if we hold that opinion, let us hold it frankly and boldly ; and, having determined to grant measures of equality as far as it may be in our power to do so, do not let us attempt to stint our action in that sense when we come to the execution of that which we have announced to be our design. But there really, as I shall explain, is no room for any suspicion of either Ultramontane or any other influence with respect to the measure which I am now about to submit to the House. The truth is that circumstances entirely independent of our own will have precluded us from holding communications with any of the large bodies which may be said, as bodies, to be interested in Irish University education. The Governing Body of Trinity College, Dublin, have thought fit, in the exercise of their discretion—a discretion which they had a perfect right to exercise—to adopt a policy and to propose a plan of their own, or, at least, to associate themselves with the plan which was proposed in this House by the hon. Member for Brighton,<sup>1</sup> with the direct concurrence and sanction of one, perhaps of both, of the Members of the Dublin University.<sup>2</sup> That being so, it is obvious that it would not have been consistent with the respect which we owe to that learned body that we should have attempted to induce it by private persuasion to accept a plan of a different character, or that we should have entered into communications with it as to the nature of the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. H. Fawcett.<sup>2</sup> Mr. J. T. Ball and Hon. David Plunket.

proposal which we are about to lay before the House. Under these circumstances, the principles of equal dealing prevented us from similar proceedings in any other quarter. Therefore, the door was shut in that direction by no act of ours, but by an act altogether independent of ourselves; and consequently it was plain that the best course for us to take was to look as well as we could to the general justice and equity of the course we felt ourselves called upon to pursue, to devise a plan founded upon our own matured convictions, to spare no labour in drawing up the details of that plan, and to forego altogether the advantage—an advantage often considerable—of holding communications beforehand with the various parties who were interested in the matter. Therefore, the measure I am about to submit to the House is a measure solely of the Government. It is a measure of the Government alone; our responsibility for which is undivided, and our hopes of the acceptance of which are founded entirely upon what we trust will be found to be its equity and its justice. The provisions of the Bill have been drawn up without any disposition to shape them for the purpose of currying favour or of conciliating any irrational prejudice, or of enabling the Government to pursue any other course than that which the most enlightened patriotism and the objects we have in view must dictate to every honourable mind.

I think it will be for the convenience of the Committee if I endeavour, in the first place, as briefly as possible, to put aside a variety of alternative plans with regard to which numerous critics, who apparently know a great deal more about our own intentions and desires than we do ourselves, have from time to time assured the public that the Government have determined to adopt. Not satisfied with a single revelation, these well-informed intelligencers, for fear the interest of their readers in the subject should flag, have perhaps in the following week informed them that “the Government had deviated from the plan they announced last week, and have adopted another plan,” the provisions of which they again proceed to announce. Thus a lively interest in the question has been kept up. It was once said by an old poet that it was pleasant to stand on the seashore and to observe the mariner labouring on the sea, and it is often a source of amusement to public men engaged in preparing a measure of public importance to observe the floundering announcements with regard to it which from time to time are made by those who neither do nor can know anything about it. The

first of these suggested plans to which I need refer is that which is founded on denominational endowment. I need only say, with regard to this plan, that Her Majesty's Government were precluded from adopting any scheme which involves denominational endowment by more than one conclusive objection. Denominational endowment, whether applied to a University or to a College in Ireland, would be in opposition to the uniform and explicit declarations which have been made, ever since this question assumed a new position six or seven years ago, by, I believe, every Member of the Government, and as I can safely assert, by myself. But it is not only the fact that denominational endowment is so contrary to our pledges that if it is to be adopted at all it must be by some other Administration than ourselves. Such pledges are, of course, in themselves conclusive ; but there are other reasons which would compel us to refuse consideration to it, even if we were not bound by them. Were we free in the matter ; and were the national convictions upon the subject less strong than I believe them to be, I confess I should think that the plan of denominational endowment in the circumstances in which Ireland is placed would be one unwise in principle to adopt. I doubt whether it would be favourable to the true interests of academical learning. I likewise doubt whether it would not lead the Government into hopeless confusion by entailing upon it the performance of an impossible task. The immediate result of such a plan would be an interference of the State with the management of institutions now entirely free, and an attempt, for which the State would be quite unfit, to adjust as between different classes the balance of power within them. If we are to give the money of the public to institutions founded by particular religious persuasions for the advancement of their own views by means of academical education, we must take precautions with respect to the use of that money, and it would be a gross folly on the part of Parliament and of the Government were they to undertake to hold the balance between rival powers with the mutual relations of which they have nothing to do. Next, Sir, there was the plan which was adopted in 1866 by the Government of that day, which included many of my present colleagues. This measure was founded upon the belief that the wants of Ireland with regard to University education might, in a great degree, be met by extending the basis of the Queen's University so far as to admit of extending the examination for degrees within its precincts to students from other Colleges, of whatever

religious denomination they might be, or of students who belonged to no College at all. But that plan has entirely broken down. In the first place the reception it met with at the time was not such as to give us any encouragement to proceed with it ; and, in the second place, a proposal that may have been equal to the circumstances of 1866 is not equal to those of 1873. The circumstances of Ireland have changed since 1866 with regard to this matter of public instruction, and therefore any idea of proposing a scheme of that nature had not been entertained by Her Majesty's Government for a single instant. Another plan which has suggested itself to many minds is that of establishing a new University in Ireland by the side of the Dublin University and by the side of the Queen's University, which is also an University placed by its charter in the City of Dublin. Certainly, such a plan had one recommendation in its favour—namely, that it would present to us the novelty of the existence of three Universities in one city. I doubt very much whether, in any period of the history of the world, or, at any rate, whether at this moment anywhere in Europe, such a singular arrangement is to be found as would result from the adoption of such a plan ; and I also doubt whether we should act for the advantage of academical education were it to be adopted merely for the purposes of political expediency—that is to say, for the relief of the Government and of Parliament in a moment of difficulty. Under these circumstances, this is not a proposal that I could undertake to recommend to the House of Commons for their acceptance. I must further add with reference to this proposition that the three Universities to be established under it would scarcely have a fair start. The present University of Dublin, sustained by enormous property and powerful traditions ; the Queen's University, with its means comparatively limited, and its constitution much more narrow ; and the third University, hobbling and lagging behind the second as much as the second would behind the first—could scarcely be said to stand upon a footing conformable to justice. That would not be a state of things that would be regarded by any of us with great satisfaction, and would not be a course of proceeding by which we could hope to effect a real settlement of this great question.

A few minutes ago, Sir, we heard read from the Table of the House that paragraph of Her Majesty's speech in which reference was made to University Education in Ireland ; it is a paragraph in so far significant that it draws a broad and clear distinction

between the two portions of this subject, which distinction we have kept in view all along. The second of them relates to the rights of conscience. And the rights of conscience are, as we think, deeply concerned in this question, because we hold that there has long been a religious grievance in Ireland, arising out of the existing state and law of University education, and that it is our duty, in offering any proposal to Parliament as a settlement of this question, to make provision for the complete removal of all religious grievances. But, at the same time, it would be a great mistake to suppose that the religious grievance constitutes either the whole or the main question before us. It certainly forms an essential part of it as a negative condition, but the positive and substantive part is that which relates to the promotion of academical learning in Ireland. These two matters I shall endeavour to keep separately in view while I address the House on this subject, as they have all along been kept separately in view by the Government. I am by no means prepared to state that there is no likelihood of conflict between these two principles. It is perfectly plain that the old academical learning, which included teaching in all subjects, must be modified ; because where there is a difference of religious convictions to be provided for, it is impossible to retain the perfectness and completeness which academical learning possessed in the olden time. A large number of Her Majesty's subjects are at this moment debarred from University training because they send their children to places of education where their religion is taught by authority, as part of the training in those institutions. Now, it may be said that, even though this may be true, two questions are to be raised—first, is the allegation true ; and, secondly, if it is true, are the persons who thus withhold their children from University training right or are they wrong ? Let me observe, in the first instance, that the question is not whether we agree with them or no. Parliament has advisedly determined to give the preference to academical institutions which are not denominational. This, in the three kingdoms, is the Imperial policy, and to it, in all instances, we shall adhere. But there is more to say. When it was observed in former times that the great majority of the people of Ireland were Roman Catholics, it was answered, “ So much the worse for them ; let them adopt the true religion, and then all difficulties will disappear.” But Parliament came to the conclusion that it was its duty to recognize the fact and to accept the consequences. There are many Presbyterians who

desire to be educated in a College where their own religion is taught, and the existence at this moment of Magee College, under a most able Principal who, I believe, enjoys very high repute in the Presbyterian body, notwithstanding all its difficulties by reason of exclusion from University training, affords a proof that this belief, that education should be given in connexion with denominational teaching, is not confined to the Roman Catholic communion. I have said it is not our business to inquire whether the Roman Catholics are right in their opinion, or whether they are wrong. The question for us is rather this—supposing they are wrong, is it right in us, or is it wise, that they should be excluded from University training? For that is the course which, up to this moment, has been pursued. I do not think that Englishmen, who are accustomed to send their own sons for the most part to those institutions where they are trained in their religion by the same authority that communicates to them the other parts of education, can very severely condemn this error of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and of some of the Presbyterians of Ireland, if error it is proved to be.

Now, I will look at the question in a very simple form. What is the state of the case as to the actual enjoyment of University training by the Roman Catholics of Ireland? I shall not enter into those details of controversy which have been handled with great ability by gentlemen on one side and the other. There are those who think, and who are bold enough to maintain, that upon the whole, considering who Roman Catholics are, considering how little property they possess, how little it is possible for them to enter upon the higher culture, their state, so far as University education is concerned, is not very bad at this moment. I hold, on the contrary, that it is miserably bad. I go farther; and I would almost say, it is scandalously bad. I will go into figures, which will at least bring to a test the proposition that I have laid down; but, in applying those figures, I will first protest against the manner in which the subject has hitherto been handled, and will call the attention of the Committee to a distinction which it appears to me they ought to bear in mind in order that they may estimate correctly the facts. In the Queen's Colleges, Ireland, the total number of matriculated students is returned to me as 708. The number of Roman Catholics among them is 181, or somewhat over one-fourth. But my proposition is this:—In the Return there is a fundamental fallacy; the great bulk of these matriculated students, or, at least, a very large portion of them,

are simply professional students, and are not students in Arts. But when we speak of University education as an instrument of the higher culture, we mean University education in Arts. Schools of law, schools of medicine, schools of engineering, and I know not how many other schools, are excellent things ; but these are things totally distinct and different from what we understand by that University training which we look upon as the most powerful instrument for the formation of the mind. Therefore I am obliged to break down these figures into fragments, and to ask, out of these 181 students, how many are students in Arts ? I now give the Roman Catholic students in Arts in the Queen's Colleges of Ireland. From 1859 to 1864, in the three Queen's Colleges, the Roman Catholic students in Arts averaged 59 ; from 1864 to 1869 they averaged 50 ; from 1869 to 1871 they averaged 45. I think these figures justify the statement that the numbers are miserably small ; and that, small as they are, they are, moreover, dwindling away. And, Sir, when I speak of recognizing only students in Arts, I am not hazarding the opinion of an individual ; I am giving utterance to a judgment which I know every University man will sustain. It is the opinion upon which the University of Dublin has uniformly proceeded in its handling of this subject. The number of Roman Catholics matriculated as students in Arts at Trinity College seems to be about 100. That may not be the exact number, but, from the figures kindly supplied to me, it must be within two or three, one way or the other. Adding these 100 at Trinity College to 45 at the Queen's Colleges we have 145 as the whole number of persons whom 4,000,000 and upwards of Roman Catholics in Ireland at present succeed in bringing within the teaching of a University to receive academical training in the faculty of Arts. Well, I think that is a proportion miserably small. It is something, but it is really almost next to nothing. Again, Sir, the total number of students in Arts in Ireland I find to be 1,179. So that the Roman Catholics, with more than two-thirds—I think nearly three-fourths of the population—supply only an eighth part of the students in Arts. I think there are hardly any in this House who will think fit to say that that is anything like an adequate proportion—anything like the numbers which they ought to furnish, even after making every allowance which ought fairly to be made for the relative proportions of Roman Catholics in the different classes of the community. Well, I think, then, I have shown that there is a great religious grievance in Ireland. Had I

been able to point to a state of things in which the movement was in the other direction—in which, instead of an almost constant decrease of Roman Catholic attendance at the Queen's Colleges, there was a steady, healthy and progressive increase—the case would have been greatly different. You might have said, "It is well to wait and see what happens." But I am afraid if we wait to see what happens, the only result of that would be to aggravate a state of things already sufficiently bad.

I now, Sir, quit the topic of the religious grievance. But quite apart from the religious grievance, there is a great and strong necessity for academical reform in Ireland. I will test the question first as to the quantity or supply of academical training in that country; and all along I will keep broadly and plainly in view the distinction between training in Arts and mere professional training. Now, in Trinity College there are attending lectures in Arts 563 young men, about the same number—I think it is a little more—as attend in Trinity College, Cambridge. In the Queen's Colleges the students in Arts are as follow—I take the year 1871, which is the latest I possess:—At Belfast, 136; at Cork, 50; and at Galway, 35—in all 221. Adding these two figures together we get 784 as the total for Ireland of University students in the proper sense of the word; that is to say, in the sense in which it is understood in Scotland, much more in the sense in which it is understood in England. 784 is the whole number of students who are receiving regular instruction in Arts, for the whole of Ireland with its five and a half millions of population. But there are a large number of students in the Queen's Colleges who are receiving professional education in law, in medicine, and in engineering. The number of these is at Belfast 201, at Cork 174, and at Galway 80—in all 455. Thus, when we include students preparing for a professional career with the Arts students, we come up to 1,239. Finally, there are a large number of persons who belong to Trinity College, Dublin, who have the honour of paying, without any deduction, all the fees of Trinity College, Dublin, but who receive from Trinity College, Dublin, no other benefits—and great benefits they are shown to be, or the price would not be paid for them—than those of examination and a degree. The number of these is 395, so that in this way we get up the number of University students in Ireland to the very poor and scanty figure of 1,634, of whom less than one-half are University students in the English or in the Scottish sense of the word. Of students in that sense in Ireland there are but 784,

against 4,000 whom Scotland, with not much more than half the population, sends to her Universities. I think that is a pretty strong case as regards the absolute supply of University and academic training in Ireland. But the case is stronger still when we consider the comparative state of the academical supply. Take the Queen's Colleges, those valuable institutions which we should heartily desire to see in a flourishing condition. From 1859 to 1864 they matriculated on the average 226 persons per annum. This is in Arts and other faculties taken together. From 1864 to 1869 they matriculated 1,039 persons, or on an average of 208 persons. In each of the years 1870-71 they matriculated 200 persons. Thus, as far as the Queen's Colleges are concerned, even the present narrow supply of academic training is a supply tending downwards. What is the case as regards Trinity College? Having a strong sentiment of veneration and gratitude for that institution, which has done in Ireland a large portion of the good which has been done for her at all, I observe with the greatest regret the decline in the number of students there. I now draw no distinction between resident and non-resident students; and I find that during the period of years from 1830 to 1834 the annual matriculations were 433. Then, taking a period of fifteen years down to 1849, at the end of which the Queen's Colleges were founded, the matriculations had sunk to 362 per annum; while from 1849 to 1872 they had again sunk to 295. Thus, Sir, we find, upon examining this matter to the bottom, that notwithstanding the efforts of Parliament, notwithstanding the general increase of education, notwithstanding the opening of the Queen's Colleges with large endowments, the University students of Ireland in the proper sense—that is, the students in Arts—are fewer at this moment than they were forty years ago, when no Queen's Colleges were in existence. I have shown you that, at this moment, the students in Arts in Ireland, even including men who are merely examined and who do not attend lectures, only number 1,179; but I find that in 1832 the students in Arts at Trinity College alone were 1,461. Sir, I think I have now sufficiently made good my case as to the supply of academic training in Ireland and the necessity of reform so far as such a necessity can be deduced from the mere paucity of supply.

And here I pause for one moment to rebut the charge that this state of things, though it would not do for Scotland or for England, will do for Ireland. It is not true that Ireland is indifferent to culture. Irishmen have their vices as well as their

virtues, like every other people on the face of the earth ; but among their virtues has been an appetite for culture, abiding and struggling for the opportunity to act even under all the difficulties and all the disadvantages of their position. Look at the College of Maynooth. Some people will tell me that at Maynooth there is no culture at all. Now, I will not enter into that debate ; but it surely must be admitted, even by the most hostile, that, if not culture in the broadest sense, it is at all events relative culture. Allowing for differences of religion, the Maynooth student is raised by the training he receives in that College far above his original level, and is so raised by a course of culture ; and every one who has the happiness of knowing the accomplished gentleman who presides over the College will know that such a man would not be found at the head of an institution where the spirit of culture was not encouraged. What is the case at Maynooth ? Quoting from a pamphlet by a Roman Catholic gentleman who enjoys one-half the name of my hon. friend<sup>1</sup> and who possesses, I think, not less than one-half his ability also, I find that during the three years 1866-69 the average number of entrances was 90 per annum. Since that time the income of Maynooth has been cut down to perhaps little more than a moiety by the arrangements of 1869, though it receives a considerable income still ; but the entrances, instead of going down, have risen from 90 to an annual average of 105 ; and Dr. Lyons distinctly states that, over and above any advantages that the Maynooth students derive from the College, it costs each of them on an average £50 a year to go to Maynooth, the great bulk of these students being, as he says, the sons of the smaller farmers of the country. But the case does not rest upon a casual illustration from Maynooth. It is really an appealing to the whole history of Ireland that she may make a plea for herself, and refuse to be smitten with this condemnation of indifference to culture. Sir, there is a love of letters in Ireland. Ireland is not barbarous in mind. She can say justly on her own behalf—

“Nec sum adeo informis : nuper me in litore vidi,  
Cum placidum ventis stabat mare.”

If only we will give her a tranquil sea in which to mirror herself, it will be in fair visage that she will return to the view.

Now, I am about to criticize the constitution of Trinity College, Dublin, and the Dublin University, that one of the most astounding academic constitutions which it could ever have

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lyon Playfair.

entered into the head of man to devise has, notwithstanding, through a liberal and enlightened administration, been made to produce great benefits to the country. This constitution is in everything almost exactly the opposite of that which, according to admitted rules, it ought to be. The University of Dublin is in absolute servitude to the College of Dublin. But when, twenty-two years ago, we began to think about the reform of the English Universities, what was the first thing we endeavoured to do? We endeavoured to emancipate the University from the exclusive sway of the Colleges; and that we did in Cambridge, where there were 17 Colleges and Halls, and in Oxford, where there were 24—this immense diversity producing, of necessity, a great variety and play of influences. But here we have the case of a single University, with a single College, and the University is in absolute servitude to the College. When I say, “in servitude to the College,” what does that mean? The College is a large and illustrious body. Does it mean in servitude to the whole assembly of the College? Certainly not. It means eight gentlemen who elect the other Fellows, who elect also themselves, and who govern both the University and the College. That is the state of things which we find in the University of Dublin and in Trinity College. The Provost and seven Fellows are the persons who appoint, to begin with, the Chancellor of the University. He is not elected as in Oxford and Cambridge, and, I think, in some or all of the Scotch Universities; nor is he appointed by the Crown. He is appointed by the Provost and seven Fellows. But when he is appointed, what can he do? What is there the Chancellor of the University of Dublin can do except by the command or with the assent of the Provost and seven Fellows? As I understand one of the great functions of the Chancellor of the University is to convoke the Senate of the University; but at Dublin he cannot do this except upon the requisition of the Provost and seven Fellows. And when the Senate is convoked, the Provost and the seven Fellows or the Provost alone, have the power at any moment by absolute veto to stop any of its proceedings. Now that is the position of the University of Dublin in reference to Trinity College. No degree, again, can be granted by the University of Dublin unless it receives a proposal to that effect from the College; that is, from the Provost and the seven Fellows. On the other hand, when it has received this permission, it cannot refuse to grant the degree, unless it votes in the negative three times over, when the matter stands for further consideration at

the next meeting of the Senate. Well, Sir, these things are singular. They are hardly credible. And now, to crown it all, let me give you the truly Irish consummation. (*A laugh.*) I beg pardon for having used that phrase, but, as I hope to be well-mannered in general towards Ireland, I may be forgiven that single offence. It is, then, a fact that the Senate of the University of Dublin was formally incorporated by letters patent in 1857; and it has been acting, as has been always supposed, upon the strength of those letters patent ever since. They have been referred separately to two of the ablest lawyers in Ireland—Sir Abraham Brewster, the ex-Lord Chancellor, and Baron Fitzgerald; and both of those eminent lawyers entertained the gravest doubts whether—or rather I should say they evidently are of opinion that—the letters patent are invalid, and not worth the paper on which they are written. This, Sir, is a singular state of things with respect to the constitution of the University, and, certainly, the stranger it is, the more credit is due to those who have administered its affairs in its relation to the College; but even this is not all. I have heard the hon. and learned gentleman the junior Member for the University of Dublin,<sup>1</sup> in language with which I strongly sympathized, pleading for academic freedom against political party, and against the interference of the State and Crown. But how does Trinity College itself stand with regard to such interference? Why, Sir, as the University of Dublin is absolutely dependent upon the College, the whole supreme power of legislation for the College lies with the Crown. It can override the Provost and seven Fellows to any extent it pleases. And I will now make a premature revelation for the satisfaction of the hon. and learned gentleman as to what we are going to propose. I hope we shall be able to propose, on behalf of Trinity College, a somewhat more independent constitution than that which it now possesses. Well, Sir, I think I have shown that, if there be anything sound in the principle for which I am contending, and the absolute necessity of which has been, as a general rule, admitted—namely, the principle of setting the University free from the exclusive dominion of the College,—I think I have shown that the present state of the constitution of the University of Dublin calls for interference—although I grant that to some extent you may make for it the same sort of argument that in 1830 and 1831 was made for the old Parliamentary Constitution—namely, that, whatever may be said

<sup>1</sup> Hon. David Plunket.

about it in the abstract, the fruits of it on the whole have been greatly better than could have been expected.

And now, Sir, while I promise not to deviate from the path which is traced out for me by the subject, I am sorry to be compelled from the necessity of the case to dwell for a while upon the University of Dublin ; upon the question what it is legally, morally, and historically, and what it ought to be. And, first of all, I desire to clear away a degree of confusion that exists in the minds of some respecting the relative position of the University of Dublin and Trinity College. To this confusion I am afraid our friends in Scotland have made a liberal contribution, because in Scotland the University and the College are for every practical purpose the same thing. According to the old Roman law, as I am informed, *universitas* and *collegium* were as nearly as possible synonymous. I have not lived much in Scotland for nearly twenty years, but when I did live there it was a common thing to hear a Scotchman say to a friend—"Have you sent your son yet to Oxford College?" The University and the College were to him exactly one and the same in idea and in fact. What I want is to sever these words effectually one from the other ; and I beg the Committee to believe, what I will distinctly show, that in the case of the University of Dublin and Trinity College they are in law and in history entirely distinct and separate bodies. It is not very easy, perhaps, to supply an analogy to illustrate their actual connexion ; but the nearest one I know belongs to the seventeenth century. It is in the famous theory of Hooker, who held that every man in England was a member of the State, and also a member of the Church ; although it was admitted they were two different forms of society, yet they presented only two different aspects of the body politic. In the same way we have had the University and the College of Dublin co-extensive as to the persons of whom they are composed. Nevertheless their academical and legal character has been perfectly distinct. The University exists apart from the College now, as it has all along existed, morally and legally apart, notwithstanding the fact of the identity of the persons of whom the two are composed. Let me try if I can prove the proposition I have stated. And, first, I will point out the separate existence of the University, because this is the basis of the measure which the Government is going to propose. It is shown, even at the present day, by the existence of the Senate. The Senate is not the Senate of the College ; it is the great assembly of the University. Whether the letters patent of 1857

be valid or not is immaterial. The Senate existed before the letters patent, and would exist without them ; but besides the Senate, the University of Dublin has other elements of a constitution perfectly distinct from that of the College. The Senate has the exclusive right to grant degrees, although it does so, I must admit, in durance vile, and under great compulsion ; but the College has no power to grant degrees, they are given exclusively by the University. The University has a Chancellor and a Vice-Chancellor, and, lastly, the University has—and this is very important—Parliamentary representation. That representation is not a representation of the College ; and here is the single case in which the two societies consist of different persons. Many of those who have taken their names off the books of the College continue to vote for Members to represent the University in this House, and they are compelled, in order to qualify for that purpose, to retain their names only on the books of the University. The University of Dublin does not, as some may suppose, originally date from the reign of Elizabeth. So far back as the year 1311, at a period when a great intellectual movement occurred in Europe, the Archbishop of Dublin, John Lech, obtained a Bull from Pope Clement V to found an University (*Universitas scholarum*) in that city. Another Archbishop of Dublin, Archbishop Alexander de Bichnor, obtained a code of statutes for the University. In 1358, Edward III founded a Lectureship in Theology in the University ; and here we encounter a singularly interesting circumstance, for Edward III provided in that foundation that, for the purpose of attending the lectures in theology, safe-conducts should be granted for the resort of students from all parts of Ireland, and these safe-conducts should be granted not only to the English of the Pale, but also to the Irish enemy, as he was commonly called, from beyond it. It is really touching to see this sign of brotherhood and of the common tie of humanity betraying itself in connexion with the foundation of the University, and in the form of a regulation for securing free access to its benefits. In 1364 the Duke of Clarence founded a Preachership and Lectureship in St. Patrick's, which was the site of the old University before the Reformation. In 1465 it appears that the Parliament of Ireland had endeavoured to found a University which, I suspect, very few gentlemen here have heard of—namely, the University of Drogheda ; and the failure of this endeavour led Pope Sixtus IV to give authority for a like foundation in Dublin, inasmuch as—so says the Pope—

there was none at that time in the island, showing that the former foundations had been broken up. In 1496 another Archbishop of Dublin taxed his clergy in Provincial Synod to find stipends for seven years for the lecturers of the University ; and from some evidence of the sixteenth century it is clear that teaching in some form or other did continue in connexion with St. Patrick's Church until about the reign of Edward VI. It is of singular interest, I think, when we consider the rudeness of the times and the disorganized state of the country, to witness those continual efforts to introduce through an University the elements of humanity and civilization. Across that sanguinary scene of war and turbulence and bloodshed, flits from time to time this graceful vision of an University, appearing to-day, disappearing to-morrow, re-appearing on an after day—

“ Par levibus ventis, volucrique simillima somno,”

but, unhappily, never able to root itself on a firm foundation in the soil, like the Universities of England, or like those of Scotland at a corresponding date.

We have now, Sir, reached the reign of Elizabeth ; and here we find that great man Sir Henry Sydney, the Lord Deputy, whose fame has been, I think, unreasonably and unjustly obscured by the more brilliant but not more solid reputation of his son, petitioning the Queen, in 1568, for the revival of the University. In 1585 Sir John Parrott, who had then succeeded to the office of Lord Deputy, proposed to dissolve St. Patrick's Church, for the purpose of founding two Universities, but Archbishop Loftus objected to that proceeding as sacrilegious. Some critical observers put another and less favourable interpretation on the objection—I do not know whether justly or not ; but there is some allegation as to the granting of leases of portions of the property to blood relations. However, Archbishop Loftus afterwards himself proposed the plan which has ultimately expanded itself into the present University of Dublin. He obtained a grant of the Monastery of All Hallows, near Dublin, and he prevailed upon Queen Elizabeth to found a college in Dublin, which college was to be *Mater Universitatis*. It is important to know what was the meaning of that expression. I will give my own version of it, and with the more confidence, because something like it has been given already by one whom I look upon as the highest of all the authorities who have dealt with the curious history of the University of Dublin—namely, the very

learned Dr. Todd, so long and honourably connected with that University. For 150 or 200 years all efforts to found a University alone had been vain ; again and again it had dissolved into thin air. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth a completely different policy was adopted, and instead of beginning with the University, it was determined to begin with the College. They, therefore, founded a College, and it was incorporated, but they did not incorporate the University, which, as a University, remains to this day unincorporated. I think that policy was a wise and sagacious one. The men of that time appear to have reasoned thus—“ Hitherto, the University has pined and died from want of the proper material to sustain it. We will supply the material which will feed the sacred flame ; for it is not here as it was in England, where the University grew as it were spontaneously, in obedience to demand, to supply a thirst for learning. If we plant firmly a nucleus of teachers and scholars, around it will gather a body of men, out of which a real and solid University will hereafter grow.” They therefore planted their College and called it *Mater Universitatis*, meaning thereby that from the College a University was to spring up, and that other Colleges were to appear from time to time within its precincts.

Now, Sir, it may appear to some that I am talking strangely when I speak thus ; but I will make good, briefly and I think conclusively, that, according to the original design of the University of Dublin—and as to the continued remembrance, and as to the maintenance of that design I will give you evidence for 200 years, from the date of Queen Elizabeth's foundation—there were to be and there ought to be other Colleges in the University of Dublin. In 1600, the College having only begun to take students in 1593, the first “ commencement,” as it was termed, was held, showing that the University was in action as distinct from the College, and this at the close of the first period, when a course of study had been completed by the very first pupils. In 1615, or some say a little earlier, the University statutes were published, and by them, with modifications, the University has been governed to this day. This was done by the College. It was to be a *Mater Universitatis*, and it was not unfaithful to its trust. Undoubtedly—and it is a large part of the case I have to state—the original design has not been fulfilled ; but I do not say it was the fault of the persons connected with the College. It was the fault and misfortune of the times, for not only were efforts made to found new Colleges in Dublin in the seventeenth century, but those efforts

took some effect ; and I find that no less than four Colleges and Halls are on record. One was founded as soon as 1604—only eleven years after the commencement of the practical operations of Trinity College—namely, Woodward's Hall. Trinity Hall was founded in 1617, and that, I think, is the one which took some root as a medical College, and subsisted down to about 1689. In 1630 New College was founded, and in the same year St. Stephen's or Kildare Hall. It is shown by these imperfect foundations, made at a time when the mother College was itself still immaturely established, that those who followed the founders of 1593 were anxious to give effect to their design of multiplying Colleges around Trinity College, which should share in the enjoyment of the same privileges ; and thereby to bring into existence the true idea of a University, as it had been understood, and as it already existed in England, which was the model they had before their eyes. But this, Sir, is not all. I will show further that the most solemn and important public documents have again and again referred to the intention of founding new Colleges in the University. In 1613 James I gave the University of Dublin the right of being represented by two Members in the Irish Parliament, and in giving it, after mentioning Trinity College, he speaks of "*aliorum collegiorum sive aularum in dicta Universitate in posterum erigendarum ac stabilien-darum.*" In his view, therefore, other Colleges were to be founded in Dublin. In 1662 the Act of Settlement empowered the Lord Lieutenant to erect another College, to be of the University of Dublin, to be called King's College, and to be endowed with any amount of property from the forfeited estates not exceeding the then very large sum of £2,000 a year. The last, and perhaps the most curious, indication I will give is of the date of 1793. The disabilities which excluded Roman Catholics from Trinity College and the University of Dublin were then removed by law ; and an Act was passed which, while it provided that they might enter Trinity College, but not share in the endowments of the College, further provided that—"Papists might take degrees, Fellowships, or Professorships in any College to be hereafter founded under that Act," subject to the double condition that such College was not to be founded for the education of Papists alone, excluding all other persons, and that it was to be a member of the University of Dublin. I think, then, I have shown with regard to that University that, according to the spirit and intent of its foundation, it is a scheme which, noble in itself, remains unfulfilled, and,

consequently, presents the strange anomalies in its constitution to which I have referred. I wish to quote, in a few words, the legal opinion of Baron Fitzgerald, given, I think, in 1858, with regard to the scope of Dublin University, and to the question how far it is conformable to its plan that it should include other Colleges with Trinity College. It is not for me, speaking among many eminent lawyers, to draw a distinction among members of the Irish Bar, but as far as I can judge from what I have heard of the opinions and writings of Baron Fitzgerald on this subject, he certainly carries in my eye the appearance of a man of very considerable weight, ability and authority in his profession. After reasoning upon other matters, he says—

“The consequences of this would of course be that by the mere creation of any other College in the University, each and every student (*studiosus*) admitted to it, whether belonging to that new College or corporation or not, would become entitled to the University privileges.”

I think I have now sufficiently indicated the historical ground upon which we feel that in dealing with this intricate and most important question it is much better to go to the root of the matter, to deal with it thoroughly, and to propound to Parliament a plan which, from its comprehensiveness and solidity, might afford promise of giving peace and of offering finality in that limited but reasonable sense in which alone it is applicable to human affairs; and I propound with some confidence to the House that the University of Dublin, as distinct from Trinity College, is the ancient, historic, national University of the country, that its constitution is in a state of the strangest anomalies, that it calls for reform, and that it is this University within the precincts of which the reform now projected for Ireland ought to take effect.

This seems to be the point in the course of my statement at which I ought to refer to the Queen's Colleges and the Queen's University. We have looked carefully at the state of the Queen's Colleges, and we have arrived at the conclusion that the College of Belfast is strongly and solidly founded, and is eminently adapted to meet the wishes and wants of a large portion of the population in the North of Ireland. We also think that the College of Cork, although not perhaps so solidly founded as Belfast, although not at any rate invested with so large a promise of expansion under favourable circumstances, presents what may be called a very fair Parliamentary case, from the number of persons it trains, as well as the efficiency of that training. With regard

to Galway College, we have arrived at a different conclusion. I am now speaking, remember, of matter which is not of the essence of the plan of the Government. The essence of the plan lies in what relates to the University of Dublin and to Trinity College. The propositions I now make are collateral to the main portion of the plan, and may be dealt with apart from it, but from a sense of their merits we are disposed to urge them strongly on the House. Galway College, if it has not materially declined, cannot certainly be said to have advanced of late years. The whole number of matriculated students in 1870-71, the Return for which is now, I believe, laid on the Table, was only 117, of whom half were medical students; and I may observe that, however excellent professional schools may be, they are not institutions which have the largest claims on the tax-payers of this country. They are rather in the nature of self-supporting institutions. Education in Arts does not directly lead, as a general rule, to remuneration; but education in Medicine will, I hope, always prove its own reward; and the whole number of students in Arts in Galway, whom I point out as the more proper objects of a public foundation—if public foundation there is to be—is only about thirty. However invidious it may be to look to pounds, shillings, and pence in these matters, and although there come from Galway a certain number of very well-instructed men, even the best article cannot be viewed without some regard to the price, and it is only right I should tell the House that the charge on the Consolidated Fund and other expenses of Galway College amount to £10,000 a year. I have called for an account of the charge to the Exchequer of every pupil in the College, and the Return given me is this:—The cost per annum to the public of every pupil is £77; the cost of every pupil carried on to a degree in Arts is £231, and the cost of every graduate in Law—I confess I grudge this the most, for I know no class which can plead less in the way of necessity for public subvention than our respected friends the lawyers—is £308. The medical charge is lower. We get a doctor—and in almost every case, I am happy to say, a very efficient doctor—for £154. Now, under these circumstances, we doubt and more than doubt, whether, when so much better arrangements are about to be made for the people of Ireland, so large a sum of public money ought permanently to continue to be applied to the purposes of Galway College. We are disposed, therefore, to recommend, with every proper consideration for vested interests in the Galway College, that measures should be

taken for winding-up within a reasonable time its transactions. The measure we propose is that the Council of the Queen's University, which will not certainly be adverse to the College, shall frame a scheme for winding-up its operations at some period before the 1st of January, 1876, a time which will allow every one connected with the College ample time to finish his career.

I pass on now to the Queen's University. The Queen's University and the Colleges, as a whole, have in my opinion rendered great service to Ireland, and if they have been prevented, as they have been prevented, from doing a great deal more good, it has been by an unhappy, if not even a strange combination of influences. I know not whether any one supposes me to be actuated by a sentiment of either open or latent hostility to the Queen's Colleges; but this I may say, that when many objected to them I spoke and voted as an independent Member of Parliament for their foundation in 1845, and have never ceased to wish them well. But now I wish to do an act of justice. It is quite true that the main cause of their comparative failure has lain in the operation of ecclesiastical influence from the Roman side. This influence, however, has been accepted, appropriated, and made their own by a very large portion of the members of the Roman Catholic Church. But what I wish to point out—and it is only fair to point it out—is this. The first blow, and it was a very serious blow, struck at the Queen's Colleges, was not struck from that quarter. There never was a plan, I believe, devised in a spirit of more tender regard for religion than the plan of the Queen's Colleges as it was framed by Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham; and those who will look back to the provisions of the Act which established the Colleges in 1845 will see the most distinct indications of their desire, on the one hand, to keep the State out of the vortex of polemical differences, and, on the other hand, to give the utmost possible facilities, to all who were so disposed, for making direct provision for instruction in religion within the walls of appropriate buildings, and in immediate connexion with the Colleges themselves. These provisions most unhappily proved abortive; but who was it that struck the first blow? On the very night when the Bill was introduced by Sir Robert Peel or Sir James Graham, my much lamented friend Sir Robert Inglis, as Member for the University of Oxford, felt it incumbent on him in the discharge of his duty to rise in his place and denounce them as a “gigantic scheme of Godless education.” And again, at the end of the debate on the second reading, so far

from softening or withdrawing the language he had used, he felt it a matter of honour to repeat it and insist on it. After that declaration so made, it was perhaps not very easy for the representative of Orthodoxy in Rome to accept as sufficiently religious for Rome what the representative of Orthodoxy in Oxford had repudiated and condemned as not sufficiently religious for Oxford. I here speak of the Colleges as a whole, and it will be distinctly understood why with these views we think that the Belfast College and the Cork College should be maintained; although with respect to Galway College the case is different, and we are of opinion that, without the smallest imputation on the teachers in it, the heavy charge it imposes is not warranted by the results. I come now to the Queen's University. We regard its influence as unmingledly good, so far as it goes; but I doubt very much whether, if we succeed in reorganizing, opening, enlarging, and liberally endowing the University of Dublin, it would be for the interest of the Queen's University to maintain a separate existence by its side. Let me point out these considerations. In the first place, if, where there are only three Colleges, and where the professors of the Colleges form the whole staff of the University—the University is not very strong, obviously it has nothing to spare—take away one of the Colleges, and the University will be weaker than it was before. In the next place we must expect, as a matter of course, that these Colleges will have to suffer more or less from the competition of an enlarged and effective University of Dublin, and from the greater liberty which will now be secured, especially for Roman Catholics, in choosing the place of their education. In the third place, if we leave it as it is, it will be excluded from those liberal endowments which we hope will be possessed and enjoyed by the University of Dublin. And, lastly, it will have no share in that great advantage—the privilege of Parliamentary representation—which the University of Dublin enjoys, and which I hope that University will always enjoy. For these reasons, and not in any penal sense, not believing that the institution is not a beneficial institution, but with a view to the yet greater advantage of those who now profit by its existence, we are of opinion that it will be a wise course if Parliament should be disposed to say that the Queen's University, which was brought into existence merely to answer the purposes of the Colleges, shall pass over into the enlarged and remodelled University of Dublin.

I come now to the question of the practical principles on which we hope Parliament will conduct that great academic reform

to which I have pointed by means of the measure we are about to introduce. By what principles are we to be guided in that reform? Parliament has been recently engaged in reforming the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; it has laid down very sound principles with respect to these Universities; these principles have not reached their fullest development, but still there they are; they have received deliberate sanction, and it is upon these principles that we propose to go with respect to the University of Dublin and Trinity College. What, then, are the great principles upon which Parliament has acted with respect to the English Universities? First of all, it has abolished tests. Upon this point there is practically no difference of opinion, because while the whole Liberal politicians of the country have desired that abolition for its own sake, under the circumstances of the time that boon is freely offered with an open hand by the authorities of Trinity College and the University of Dublin itself. But this is a negative rather than a positive reform. The next principle has been to open endowments. Where endowments are tied up by particular provisions in such a way as to render them the monopoly of comparatively few, Parliament has endeavoured to widen the access, and to increase the number of those who may compete for them, with the conviction that that is the way to render them more fruitful of beneficial results. The next, and perhaps most important principle has been to emancipate the University from the Colleges. That is what we did at once in Oxford, and we did it in two ways. The first of them was the establishment of a new Governing Body. In Cambridge, the *Caput*, supplemented by conventional meetings of the Heads of Houses, in Oxford more formally the Hebdomadal Board, composed almost wholly of the Heads of the Colleges—were in practical possession of the initiative, and were the rulers of the University. We abolished the Hebdomadal Board in Oxford and the *Caput* in Cambridge, and carried over the powers in each case to the Council. And now similarly, that we should establish a new governing body for the University of Dublin is evidently the conclusion to which both principle and policy should bring us. The other great measure of emancipation consisted in the introduction within the Universities of members not belonging to any College at all. Until within the last few years, no one could belong to the University of Oxford or of Cambridge without belonging to some College or Hall within it, just as now no one can belong to the University of Dublin without belonging also to Trinity

College. Parliament enabled the English Universities to enlarge their borders by taking in members not belonging to any College or Hall. Speaking for Oxford, I rejoice to say that Act has been fruitful of good ; and already, although the change is a very recent one, there are 120 young men to be found in the University enjoying all the benefits of careful training, but all able to pursue a social scheme of their own, to live as economically as they please, to seek knowledge in the way they like best, provided they conform to the rules of the University ; and we may reasonably expect that a very powerful element of University life will in this way ultimately be established. Another method by which we have proceeded—I will not say to emancipate the Universities, but to make the Colleges conducive to the purposes of the University—is a very important one, and that is, to use a very emphatic little word, by “taxing” the Colleges for the benefit of the Universities. That is a principle which has already received in Oxford a considerable development. We already oblige Corpus Christi, Magdalen, and All Souls Colleges to maintain Professors out of the College revenues, not for College but for University purposes ; and as for Christ Church, with which I have been myself connected, though a poor College in comparison with Trinity College—I greatly doubt whether it is half as wealthy—yet in Christ Church five Professorships of Divinity, at a cost of probably between £7,000 and £8,000 a year, are maintained out of the property of the College for the benefit of the University.

These, Sir, are the principles of academic reform on which we have proceeded in England. There are other principles which it would be necessary to observe in Ireland, in consequence of her peculiar circumstances ; yet these are the main ones. But there are two points among those which the special case of Ireland brings before us, that I must particularly notice. To the one I would refer with some satisfaction—at least as regards Trinity College—to the other with pain. It is this. If we are about to found a University in Ireland in which we hope to unite together persons of the different religious persuasions into which the community is divided, we must be content to see some limitations of academical teaching. It would not be safe, in our opinion, to enter with our eyes open into largely controverted subjects. In theology no one would wish the University of Dublin, if it be reformed, to teach ; and we also think there are some other subjects with regard to which it will be necessary to observe limitations that I will presently explain. There is another matter on

which we must pursue a course somewhat different from that taken in England. In England, when we reformed the Universities, we may say we did nothing to increase the influence of the Crown. In Ireland, as far as Trinity College is concerned, I should not propose to increase the influence of the Crown. It appears to me that it may be safely limited. But if we are to have an effective and living Dublin University with a new Governing Body, I am afraid it will be necessary to introduce for a time the action of Parliament and of the Crown in consequence of the unbalanced state of the University at the present moment—state which must continue at all events for a time. When the University arrives at a condition in which the nation can be said to be fairly represented in it, then I think the desire of Parliament will be to carry over to the University itself, as far as may be, the power of electing all its own officers and Governing Body, and to see it thrive upon those principles of academic freedom which have been allowed so much of scope in this country, on the whole with such beneficial results.

Well, Sir, these are the principles on which we propose to proceed. And, now, if the Committee will still have the kindness to follow me, I will endeavour to describe the mode in which those principles will be applied to the University of Dublin. And first, Sir, I must say it is necessary for clearness that the Committee should carefully keep in view three separate periods of time. The first period of time laid down in the Bill is the 1st of January, 1875. It is on the 1st of January, 1875, that we propose that the powers now exercised by the Provost and seven Senior Fellows of Trinity College as towards the University shall be handed over to the new Governing Body, just as in the English Universities the powers of the Hebdomadal Board and less exactly those of the Cambridge Heads were handed over to the new Governing Bodies, which represented mixed and diversified academic forces. The second period, after the 1st of January, 1875, is one of ten years, which we look upon as a provisional period, during which it will be necessary to make some special provisions that I will by-and-by state summarily to the Committee. After the 1st of January, 1885, we think we may reckon that the new scheme will in all likelihood have developed itself so largely and so freely that the permanent system of government of the University may with safety be brought into play.

I now proceed to explain the leading provisions of the Bill. First of all the University is to be incorporated by the present

Bill—a process which it has never yet undergone. The Universities of this country are incorporated ; and it is more convenient and seemly that they should be incorporated than that a particular part—namely, the Senate, as now—should be incorporated in a manner quite contrary to the analogy of our academical history. The second provision I will name is this—the separation of the theological faculty both from Trinity College, and from the University of Dublin. It appears to us that a measure of that kind follows naturally and of necessity from the changes that have already occurred in Ireland, and from the changes which have been offered on the part of the University and of Trinity College. I own it is not altogether without regret that I personally accede to that measure, for this reason :—I think that the University of Dublin has exercised a most beneficial influence over the religious character, tone, and tendencies of a large and important portion of the Irish nation. But still I freely and advisedly believe that we are right in holding that this theological faculty ought now to be served both from the University and from the College. The details of the operation will be found described in the clauses of the Bill from 10 to 15 ; and the method we pursue is this :—It is as nearly as possible analogous to the method pursued under the Church Act in the case of Maynooth College. We hand over the care of the theological faculty to the Representative Body of the Disestablished Church. We make provision—I hope ample provision—for the vested interests of the persons now holding office in the theological faculty, or discharging duties in that faculty, or discharging duties in that faculty as far as those duties are concerned. We provide that private endowments which have been created for the purposes of the theological faculty shall pass over to the Representative Body—that Body to be subject to the same responsibilities as Trinity College will lie under, if the Bill be adopted, with reference to the private endowments in Trinity College. With regard to the rest of the change affecting the theological faculty, we propose to follow exactly the analogy of Maynooth. We ask you to grant fifteen years' purchase of the annual expense ; that is, a sum equal to fifteen times the annual expense is to be handed over to the Representative Body, to be administered in trust for the purposes for which the theological faculty has existed. And, lastly, as the theological faculty—severed from the University and from the College—will no longer appear nor have accommodation in the buildings already existing, we propose that there should be a

charge on the property of the College of £15,000 to provide buildings for the theological faculty. So much as to the theological faculty.

I now come to the substantive and positive portion of our proposal, which I will describe as succinctly as I can. The principal parts and organs of the University of Dublin, as we propose that they should stand in its detached and reformed condition, are these :—First of all there is the Chancellor of the University. The case of the Chancellorship of the University of Dublin is a very peculiar one, in this respect, that he is scarcely—I speak subject to correction—more than a nominal officer so far as regards the University. He has, indeed, the privilege of appointing the Vice-Chancellor, but then the Vice-Chancellor is, unfortunately, no less nominal than himself, for all that they can do is, when they are permitted by the College, to preside in the Senate ; and when they preside there they are liable to be stopped at any moment by the action of the authorities of the College. But, although he is a nominal officer as to the University, he is not so as to the College. In virtue of his office of Chancellor of the University, he is Visitor of the College. As Visitor of the College he has all the ordinary powers of the Visitor of a College ; and besides those ordinary powers he has another real and important power—namely, that his assent to the statutes of the College is required, I think, in certain rather important cases, to give them validity. And so we have had to consider, in detaching and severing the College functions from those of the University, what course to pursue as to the Chancellor. The course we recommend is this :—We think it better, under all the circumstances, to continue the Chancellor of the University as—if I may so speak—an ornamental officer of the University, and, that being so, to attach the Chancellorship to the person of the Lord-Lieutenant for the time being. This is not a question of making over an operative State influence. If it were so, the case would be materially altered. But, viewing all the difficulties which beset any other manner of proceeding, we recommend this as least open to objection. The Vice-Chancellor we propose to leave it to the new Governing Body to elect from among themselves. He will, therefore, be a real officer, with real functions—namely, those which attach to the Chair of the Governing Body. But we also make provision that the present distinguished Chancellor of the University<sup>1</sup> shall not, by the action of the Bill, be divested

<sup>1</sup> Lord Cairns.

of those substantive powers which he possesses—powers, namely, which accrue to him in the character of Visitor of Trinity College, and the whole of which will be carefully preserved. That, Sir, is the proposal with respect to the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor.

Now, from what I have said, the House will readily understand that an important part of our proposal goes to fulfil that which has remained unfulfilled in the past by introducing new Colleges into the University of Dublin. If the House should adopt the suggestions that we have made with regard to the Queen's University and Queen's Colleges, the two first of such Colleges naturally will be those of Belfast and Cork. We shall also propose in Committee on the Bill, if agreeable to the parties, that the two voluntary institutions to which I think I have already referred—namely, the College which is called the Roman Catholic University and the Magee College—should become Colleges of the University of Dublin. I will afterwards explain what the effect of that will be. But, Sir, I by no means assume it as certain that these are the only Colleges in Ireland which might advantageously be joined to the University. We have not had the opportunity—it was impossible in the privacy which these matters require—of carrying on those communications with the parties able to inform us, which would be necessary in order to enable Parliament or to enable ourselves to form a judgment on the subject. When the Bill is placed in the hands of Members—which I have little doubt will be to-morrow morning—it will be seen that the first operative clauses enact that the Colleges enumerated in the Schedule to the Bill shall become Colleges of the University of Dublin. In turning to that Schedule it will be found that it is in blank ; but I have already named four Colleges which it is our intention, if the parties are willing, to propose to insert in it when we go into Committee on the measure. And in the time that may elapse—possibly a month—before we go into Committee, we shall probably receive further information to enable us to judge whether it is desirable or not to lengthen the list. Of course, as I have stated, we do not confine ourselves to the collegiate element, but also allow persons to matriculate in the University without belonging to any College at all.

The next change which I have to mention is probably the most important of all ; it is the constitution of the new Governing Body of the University of Dublin. I have shown that we strictly

follow the analogy of English legislation in substituting a new Governing Body for the old one, and as a necessary step in the process of emancipating—I do not use the word in any invidious sense—or detaching the University. But in the case of Oxford and Cambridge we had, already supplied to our hands, a large, free, well-balanced and composed constituency, to which we could at once intrust the election of the new Governing Body. This, it is evident, is not the case with respect to the University of Dublin. Were the new Governing Body to be elected at once by the Senate of the University of Dublin, it would represent one influence and one influence only. We have, therefore, determined to introduce an intermediate or provisional period, and we shall not ask Parliament to place in the hands of the Crown, the nomination of the Council which is to govern the University for that period ; but, passing by the Crown, shall ask the Legislature itself in the main to nominate the list of persons for that purpose. I need hardly say that we are not now prepared to bring that list of persons before the House. It would be impossible for us to do it. It was impossible for us to ask gentlemen of eminence in Ireland to allow us to propose their names until we were aware of the general view which they would be disposed to take of the plans of the Government and of the intentions of Parliament ; and I have already explained the reasons why it has not been within our power to hold any such communications. There is, however, one point on which I wish not to be misunderstood, and that is the principle on which we shall endeavour to make the selection of names which we shall submit to Parliament. There is, indeed, another class of members of the Council, to whom I shall presently refer ; but I speak now of the names we shall submit to Parliament of members whom I propose to call the ordinary members of the Council. They are twenty-eight in number, and will form the principal and therefore the predominating portion of the Council. These names of ordinary members we shall endeavour to submit to Parliament, not as representatives of religious bodies as such, but on wider grounds. For we think that the lists should be composed—without excluding any class or any man on account of his religious profession—from among all those persons in Ireland who, from their special knowledge or position, or from their experience, ability, character, and influence, may be best qualified at once to guard and to promote the work of academic education in Ireland. That is the principle on which we wish to make our choice, so far as we are concerned,

and if we make it amiss, it will be in the power of Parliament to correct it.

I will next, Sir, proceed to describe the manner in which the Council is to be brought into action. It will be necessary for it to perform certain preliminary functions before the 1st of January, 1875. It will have to matriculate students, to complete its number as I shall presently explain, and to make appointments of officers, so far as may be needed, to prepare it for entering on its career of full authority. On the 1st of January, 1875, it will take over those powers of ordinary government which have hitherto been exercised by the Provost and seven Senior Fellows of Trinity College. It will have the power to admit new Colleges over and above those named in the Act; it will have a general power of governing the University, and the function of appointing Professors and Examiners; and it is only in respect to the method of its own election that it will remain under an intermediate or provisional constitution until it reaches the year 1885, when its constitution will assume its permanent form. The composition of the Council will be made complete from the first. But I have not yet fully described the mode of its appointment. There will be the twenty-eight ordinary members to be named in the statute, as I have already mentioned. During the ten years from 1875 to 1885—the provisional period—there will be, probably, no great number, but still a certain number of vacancies in the Body which it will be necessary for us to make provision to fill up. For that limited period we propose that the vacancies should be filled alternately by the Crown and by co-optation on the part of the Council itself. At the expiration of the ten years it will come to its permanent constitution, and I will describe what that, as we propose it, is to be; and then the Committee will be able to judge of the meaning of what I said when I stated that our desire was that the University of Dublin should be founded, as far as possible, on principles of academic freedom. After ten years, we propose that service on the Council shall be divided into four terms of seven years each, four members retiring in each successive year. There will therefore be four vacancies among the twenty-eight ordinary members to be filled up every year, and those four vacancies we propose shall be filled in rotation—first, by the Crown; secondly, by the Council itself; thirdly, by the Professors of the University; and fourthly, by the Senate of the University. There is a separate provision with regard to casual vacancies in

the Council, to which I need now no more particularly refer. The ordinary members will constitute, according to the proposal of the Government, the main stock or material of the Council or Governing Body of the University ; but we have been very desirous to see in what way that which we aim at may meet the general wants and wishes of the people of Ireland ; and, considering how desirable it is to prevent the action of too strong an unitarian principle—I have, I believe, ample authority for using that word, which is familiar in the present politics of Germany—we have been very anxious to discover in what manner it might be possible to give to those bodies, which I have described as Colleges of the University, a fair opportunity, not of governing the action of the Council by any exertion of influence or combination among themselves, but of being heard in the Council, so that all views and desires with respect to education might be fairly brought into open discussion, and that right might have the best chance of prevailing. It is evident we could not adopt the system under which any one College should be allowed to send to the Council a large number of members. It is also evident that it would not be safe to adopt a system under which Colleges, insignificant in magnitude, should be permitted to claim a representation in the Council. What we wish is this—that considerable Colleges, which represent a large section of the community and of its educating force, should have a fair opportunity of making their voice heard in the Council. With regard to all those dangers which would be likely to arise from too great a rigour of unity in the examinations, or too narrow a choice in their subjects and tone, though we introduce several other provisions on the point into the Bill, it is to the freedom and elasticity of the Council itself, I think, that we should look as the main security against anything either inequitable or unwise. We propose, then, that there shall be in the Council from the outset—that is to say, from the 1st of January, 1875—a certain number of what we call collegiate members, the basis of whose position in the Council will be that any College of the University which has fifty of its matriculated students, those students being *in statu pupillari* matriculated also as members of the University, may send one member to the Council, and if such Colleges have 150 students, then it may send two members. That would be the maximum ; and this element, so far as we can judge, while it ought to be and will be secondary in point of numbers, would become very valuable and necessary for the purpose to which I have just adverted.

The Senate of the University of Dublin, as it now exists, does not, I may observe, discharge one of the living and standing duties which a University is called upon to perform. I mean the election of Representatives to be sent to Parliament. The election of Representatives for the Dublin University is mainly conducted by gentlemen who, except for that purpose, do not belong to the University at all—that is to say, who have ceased to belong to it, and who are empowered to exercise with regard to it no other function. What we propose is that henceforward the Senate shall elect the Representatives of the University. The Senate will, of course, consist of all those who are now in it, and of all the doctors and masters who may hereafter have their names kept on it according to the rules which may be in force. I need not add that care will be taken that all those individuals who are now intrusted with the privilege of the franchise will have their rights preserved ; but, for the future, we should lay down the principle that the Members for the University ought to be elected by the Senate as they are now by the Senate of Cambridge and the Convocation of Oxford, and by them alone. As to the duty of the Senate, it will be to discharge the duties heretofore discharged by the old Senate of the University, and to share in the election of the Council in the manner I have described after the provisional period has passed, and the permanent constitution comes into play.

I hope it is now understood what our proposal is with regard to the constitution of the University. And now as to those who are to compose it. I need not say that all the members of Trinity College will remain where they are. With regard to the Queen's University, we should propose to absorb the whole of its members in the Senate and the body of the University of Dublin, together with all the privileges which now attach to their respective degrees or standing. There is a further provision which we have made in order to accelerate that consummation which we all desire—namely, the rapid introduction into the University of Dublin of those varied elements that we hope will vindicate for it the title of a truly national institution. There is no difficulty in the matter as far as Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges are concerned ; because their *alumni* have already undergone University education in a recognized institution. But how are we to deal with Magee College and with any other Roman Catholic Colleges which have not any academic *status* in the eye of the State, and which, therefore, cannot be

treated by this Bill as if they had been heretofore possessed of this advantage? In our opinion it would be a great hardship on those Colleges, if their *alumni* were to be absolutely excluded from the Dublin University. We have, however, only a limited power in the matter, and what we propose in their favour is a temporary provision to the effect that, during the first three years after January, 1875, the University may, if it shall think fit, introduce into it, subject to examination, persons who have not been at any University, or College of an University, but who shall be certified to have resided for any given time as students of any College which is henceforward to belong to the University, and that an arrangement shall be made to give to such persons the advantage of the Terms which they shall have already kept.

I shall now proceed to detail the securities for conscience that will be taken in framing the constitution of the renovated University. The Committee will have gathered from what I have said that this University is to be a teaching as well as an examining University; but it is to teach under conditions in some respects limited. It can have no chair in theology; and we have arrived at the conclusion that the most safe and prudent course we can adopt is to preclude the University from the establishment of chairs in two other subjects, which, however important in themselves in an educational point of view, would be likely to give rise to hopeless contention; and were we to propose that the new University should be at liberty to establish chairs in respect of them, we should be running the most fatal risk of introducing misgiving and mistrust, which might be fatal, with regard to the rights of conscience in the new University. The two subjects to which I refer are philosophy and modern history. (*Laughter.*) I do not mean that the study of natural science is to be omitted from the list of chairs, I only refer to that of moral and metaphysical philosophy. We feel that our asking for the foundation of chairs in these subjects would be impossible in the case of a mixed University, unless we gave up all hope of obtaining for that University the general confidence of the Irish people. And permit me to say that by excluding theology from the University we do very little if in that University, under the circumstances of the present day, we appoint authorized teachers in certain branches of philosophy, because all the deepest questions of religious belief are at this moment contested, partly, indeed, within the theological precinct, but even more so in the domain

of ethics, and especially of metaphysics. The House may or may not overrule the Government in this matter ; but, at any rate, that is the conclusion at which we have arrived with reference to this question.

There is another important security for the rights of conscience with respect to the same subjects which I will mention to the House. We propose that no one shall be examined for his degree in modern history or philosophy, as I have defined it, except with his own free will. We do not think it necessary to exclude these subjects from the examination, provided the submission to examination in them is voluntary. As I have said already, the University is to be a teaching University ; but we propose to extend the voluntary principle still further, and to provide that as a rule no attendance upon the lectures of the University Professors shall be compulsorily required from the students. We intend to trust to the excellence of the instruction which will be given, and to the vast advantages the University will enjoy from being placed in the metropolis of Ireland for the attraction of students to it ; but we propose to make the attendance upon the lectures of its Professors voluntary. We propose, also, to exclude the two subjects I have lately named from the examinations for the emoluments of the University. From the examinations for honours we do not propose to exclude them, and for this reason. It is perfectly practicable to adopt the system of a positive standard as regards examinations even for honours, and you may bring up to that standard any number of men who show themselves competent to reach it ; but as regards emoluments, the competition must be between man and man ; what one gains the other must lose, and therefore we think it the best and safest method of managing these emoluments to provide that these men should meet upon a common ground upon which all can equally consent to be examined. There are some other provisions of the same kind in the Bill, because I need not say that these securities for conscience are among the most important safeguards of the Bill, and unless they are effective we cannot expect the Bill to work, neither should we desire it to be accepted by the House. Among these, we have provided a clause somewhat analogous to one which appears in the Education Act with reference to the punishment of masters who persistently offend against the conscientious scruples of the children whose education they conduct. We provide that a teacher in the University may be punished or reprimanded if he wilfully offends the conscientious

scruples of those whom he instructs in the exercise of his office. But I am bound to say that the main security for the rights of conscience on which we rely is such a representation of all parties, within moderate and safe limits, in the body of the Council, as can be usefully and beneficially introduced into its constitution.

The next and the last of the more difficult subjects I shall have to lay before you is that which relates to the contribution which Trinity College will have to make to the University of Dublin. It appeared to us in reference to this subject that one principle was absolute, and could not be made the subject of discussion in this House. That was the principle that the present office bearers and teachers in Trinity College should not be made losers by the direct operation of the Act. The charge resulting from the adoption of this principle will probably amount on a rough estimate to about one-half of the entire value of the property of the College. If this mode of proceeding should be adopted for giving security to their interests, we shall propose that the residue of the property of the College shall be divided into two moieties, one of which shall pass to the new University, and the other shall remain the property of the College. The proposition will, of course, leave untouched the income derived by the College from voluntary payments. This is a principle on which we have already acted to some extent in England; but at present we have not carried it out so far as will, I apprehend, be thought necessary in future. A Commission is at present sitting for the purpose of examining into the property of the Universities and Colleges in England, and there cannot be a doubt, from such knowledge of opinions as I possess, that when that Commission reports, it will be found necessary, after making the most liberal provision for the wants of the Colleges themselves, that considerable sums, especially in Cambridge, where the principle has as yet been applied only to a very limited extent, will be available for the requirements of the University. It is only fair that, as the degrees conferred by the Universities bring people to the Colleges, the latter should contribute to the support of the former. And it will especially be fair to adopt this principle with regard to Trinity College, seeing that it has received all its endowments not simply for performing the duties and functions of a College, but also that it might be *mater universitatis*, that its means might be available for an University. The property of Trinity College is estimated in round numbers at £55,000 a year. Between an increase in the amount of the rents and the

interest of a large sum of money which it will receive on account of its ecclesiastical advowsons it will immediately have an increment of £7,000 or £8,000 a year. The voluntary payments amount to about £23,000 a year, making in all £86,000 a year prospectively, and £78,000 at present. Its expenses are stated at £66,000 a year and some hundreds, and there is a surplus of receipts above expenditure of £11,600. Under these circumstances, what we propose to do I will now explain. That mode of proceeding to which I lately referred—namely, the mode of charging the property with the vested interests and providing for a division of the ultimate residue—although it proceeds upon an intelligible principle, yet in practice would be operose, slow, and perhaps vexatious as to details. It would give room for differences of opinion. We have therefore placed a provision for giving effect to that proceeding only in a Schedule to the Bill. In the Bill itself we have introduced provisions of a very simple character, to this effect—that upon the property of Trinity College there shall be laid a charge of £12,000 a year, to be redeemed within fourteen years, and at twenty-five years' purchase. I have already stated that the surplus revenue over its expenditure is more than £11,000; and £12,000 a year, deducted from £78,000, which appears to be the total receipt, would leave £66,000, or deducted from £55,000 a year, the present estimated property of Trinity College, it would leave £43,000 a year, with an immediate impending increment of £7,000 or £8,000, making an endowment from these sources equivalent to about £50,000 a year. In truth, after making the charge of contribution which we propose to take for the benefit of the University, Trinity College would remain perhaps the wealthiest College in existence in Christendom. At any rate I am aware of only one rival—namely, Trinity College, Cambridge, which educates and teaches nearly the same number as are educated and taught in Trinity College, Dublin. Undoubtedly there are other influences that would act on Trinity College in connexion with this Bill. It will lose its profits from degrees, which are stated at £2,300 per annum. But there are various provisions in the Bill which would enable Trinity College to economize its operations, and I must say, without fear of offence, that there are great and needful economies to be effected in Trinity College itself. We have introduced into this Bill a provision intended to facilitate the transfer in certain cases of Trinity College Professors to University Chairs. There may be cases in which Trinity College, as discharging the duties

of an University, had to incur the expense of maintaining a very large and complete staff of Chairs where we think it might be for the convenience and advantage of all parties that in some of those instances Trinity College might make over its Professors to the University and with its Professors the charge of maintaining them. These are the leading provisions, which I think contain the essential outline of the plan, so far as Trinity College is concerned.

I will now point out, in a very few words, what would be the position of the University according to our proposition with respect to what it will require in order to full efficiency, and with respect to the sources from which the money is to be had. We think this University of Dublin, if it is to be the great national University of Ireland in accordance with its original design, should be liberally supplied—first, with the means of teaching; and, secondly, with the means of encouraging and rewarding study. We have not inserted in the Bill any of the provisions which I am now going to sketch, but it is right that I should state to the House what our views are; because it may be thought expedient when we come to the Committee on the Bill actually to determine the amount of the property which shall be placed at the disposal of the University of Dublin. We think there might be ten fellowships, of £200 a year each, given annually by way of reward, and tenable for five years, which, for fifty fellowships in all, would entail a charge of £10,000. We think there might be twenty-five annual exhibitions of £50 each, tenable for four years, which would entail a total charge, when they were in full operation, of £5,000. We think there might be 100 bursaries a year of £25 each, tenable for four years, creating an annual charge of £2,500 or in the whole £10,000. These bursaries would be of the greatest advantage in stimulating the youth of Ireland; and to establish them would be to do something analogous to that which has been done with such great advantage by private benefactors in Scotland for the encouragement of study in the Scotch Universities. These grants for the encouragement and reward of study would in the whole amount to £25,000 a year. The charge for the professors' chairs might possibly be from £15,000 to £20,000 a year more, which might create a charge of £45,000 a year. The other charges would be those for examinations, for the ordinary government of the University, and for the buildings which would be necessary for lecturing and teaching purposes. £12,000 a year, as I have said, is the contribution of Trinity College to University purposes from the fulfilment of which it is to be relieved. £10,000

a year is the equivalent, or very nearly, of what the Consolidated Fund now pays for Galway College and the Queen's University. We conceive that a further sum of £5,000 a year may be obtained for the University by means of fees on a very moderate scale. Our view is that for the remainder of the money required for the purposes of the University we may most properly and beneficially resort to the surplus of the ecclesiastical property of Ireland. It will be remembered that this surplus is to be made available for the national wants of Ireland. The present state of things with regard to it is this. The property of the Irish Church was estimated at £16,000,000. The amount charged upon it from all sources in connexion with the liquidation of the Maynooth Grant, the liquidation of the *Regium Donum*, and all the rest was taken at £11,000,000, and the surplus at £5,000,000. I am told that no more precise estimate can be given at this date. Parliament has legislatively declared that that surplus shall be mainly, but it has not said that it shall be exclusively, devoted to the relief of corporal wants and necessities. If that devotion to corporal wants and necessities is not to be exclusive, I know no more just purpose to which the residue could be applied than in aiding the funds of the new University. In our opinion it would be most just to make a call upon a portion, though it need be only a very limited portion, of the surplus ecclesiastical property of Ireland.

There are only two other points that I have to name in the very lengthened statement which I am inflicting upon the House. We do not propose to introduce into this Bill any plan for the internal reform of Trinity College. So far as we are concerned, we wish to place in the Governing Body of Trinity College the same confidence that they will effect, or suggest, all necessary reforms as has been placed in the Governing Bodies of the English Colleges. We propose to relieve it from its absolute dependence upon the Crown, and to place it upon the same footing as that on which the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge now stand—namely, the footing on which they are authorized to prepare schemes for the regulation of their own government, which schemes, when they have gone through the ordeal of being passed by the Queen in Council, may have the force of law. As I am reminded by my right hon. friend,<sup>1</sup> we have, of course, framed clauses for the purpose of at once opening the offices and emoluments of Trinity College, without any religious test. I took this matter so much for granted that I had almost omitted to mention it.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Cardwell.

I have thus ventured to sketch the measure we propose for establishing a free—if I may not say an emancipated—University of Dublin. Let me say a word or two now as to the future position of the Colleges in that University. Trinity College, as I have shown, will undoubtedly no longer have the exclusive power of granting degrees, though it must always largely influence by its intrinsic weight the movements of the University. It will have a certain diminution of income by the contribution we shall take from it ; and it may, I grant, with respect especially to its non-resident students, undergo a certain diminution in numbers, and thus the amount of its voluntary payments. But what will it have upon the other side ? In the first place, it will have, as I hope, a termination to controversy—at least, to all political controversy. It will remain, as I trust, in its outward dwelling unchanged. There will be nothing to break the course of its traditions. Long—I trust for generations and for ages—it will continue to dispense, more unrestrainedly than ever, the blessings of a liberal culture. It will enjoy self-governing powers, subject only to a reasonable control, and free, I think, from all apprehension, or vexatious interference. It will undoubtedly receive some new form of constitution, in which the important and valuable Working Body of Trinity College will exercise far more power than it exercises now, which, indeed, is only moral power, whereas the actual power of the actual Teaching Body of Trinity College, if I understand aright, is none whatever. The present University statutes and the existing system of examination in Trinity College will necessarily form the starting-point for the proceedings of Dublin University, and it will be for the Council of Dublin University to consider how far these may require either expansion or modification. Trinity College will have the means of being heard in the Council, because there will be more, many more, than 150 of its members—of the matriculated students of Trinity College—who will be members of Dublin University ; and it must therefore have the power of sending two members to the Council. Its students will have access to a large number of additional emoluments. But here arises a question. Is it fair that those who already possess the rich emoluments of Trinity College should have free access to the emoluments of the University of Dublin, such as I have sketched them ? The fair rule, as we think, will be this :—In our opinion it would not be right or wise to enact any exclusion of any person belonging to the University from competition for the emoluments of the University

in respect to his belonging to any particular body, however richly endowed ; but we propose to provide that no holder of academical emoluments in Ireland—and in the interpretation clause we have defined what we mean by public academical emoluments—shall hold any one of the emoluments, encouragements or rewards of the new University, without surrendering the prior academic emoluments which he holds. The effect will be that a member of Trinity College will have everything thrown open to him ; but he must not hold both his own and the University emoluments. He must take his choice, and I suppose he will choose to take the best, whichever it may be. This limitation of pluralities, so to call them, has reference to emoluments of encouragement and reward, not to teaching offices. For example, with regard to the Junior Fellows of Trinity College, there will be no such limitation, for it would be absurd to apply the rule to a Junior Fellow receiving only £40 a year—and, I believe, £40 Irish from his Fellowship—and the rest of his income from his labour. Trinity College will have, upon the whole, access to a large number of academic emoluments ; and, in common with every other College in Dublin, and especially with the Roman Catholic University College, it will enjoy one, as I think, very great advantage to which I have not yet referred. The University will place at its doors, not an absolutely complete, but a nearly complete, staff of professional chairs. These chairs will, I hope, be held with tolerably liberal remuneration by men of high reputation, and it will be in the power either of Trinity College, or of the Roman Catholic College, or of any College, to consider whether it shall be at the expense of maintaining chairs, which may in certain cases entail a corresponding charge, heavy in proportion to their importance ; or whether it shall avail itself, without any charge at all beyond a moderate fee, of lectures which will be delivered at its doors. All these appear to me to be important compensating considerations, so far as Trinity College is concerned.

Now, what will be the position of voluntary Colleges ? and I hope they may somewhat multiply, though a Roman Catholic College is the only one actually existing in Dublin. They will enjoy an entire freedom as to internal government. With respect to ecclesiastical and lay power, I submit that in those voluntary institutions the parties must settle this question among themselves. If it passes their wisdom to do it, it passes our wisdom too. All we can do is to give them an open career and fair play ;

and I think it will be seen that the access to University degrees will henceforth be perfectly free to the members of these Colleges. Together with free access to University degrees, there will be free access to University emoluments upon a large scale for them and for all Ireland. If their numbers entitle them to send one, or possibly in some rare case, two members to the Council, they will have the power to make their view, whatever it may be, known in the Council, and they will, if in Dublin, have the same power to economize their own resources to whatever extent they may think fit by making use of the chairs of the University. If more than this be asked—if it be said “this is not establishing the equality we want to establish between the Roman Catholics and Trinity College”—my answer is plain. It is that Trinity College is a public institution. It has been, and it will remain, under a certain control by the Crown and by Parliament. But more than that it is an institution which—although I admit the operation of this change must be very slow—has voluntarily denounced its denominational safeguards, and which proposes to make the whole of its emoluments and offices accessible to all Irishmen who may be its members, entirely irrespective of religious distinctions. Parliament has adopted for many years in its policy the principle that these are the Colleges to which alone public endowments shall be given. And if I am told, on the other hand, that Trinity College has a great start in the race, while among Roman Catholics, and to a certain extent among Presbyterians, almost everything has still to be organized, I admit the fact; but I know of no cure save one—to strip Trinity College bare of its estates and to destroy its whole machinery. Such a proceeding would really be the creation of solitude in order to call it peace. But it is a remedy which has never been tolerated or even heard of, and never would be tolerated or, I hope, heard of, within the walls of the British Parliament.

Sir, I feel that the House of Commons must look forward to the end of this speech with much the same feeling as it generally looks forward to the end of the Session, and that the sense of relief when it arrives will be very much the same. I have very few words more to speak. This is an important—I would almost say, considering the many classes it concerns and the many topics it involves, it is almost a solemn subject; solemn from the issues which depend upon it. We have approached it with the desire to soothe and not exasperate. I hope that in the lengthened address I have delivered to the House I have not said any-

thing that can offend. If I have been so unfortunate, it is entirely contrary to my intention and my honest wish. We, Sir, have done our best. We have not spared labour and application in the preparation of this certainly complicated, and, I venture to hope, also comprehensive, plan. We have sought to provide a complete remedy for what we thought and for what we have long marked and held up to public attention as a palpable grievance—a grievance of conscience. But we have not thought that, in removing that grievance, we were discharging either the whole or the main part of our duty. It is one thing to clear away obstructions from the ground; it is another to raise the fabric. And the fabric which we seek to raise is a substantive, organized system, under which all the sons of Ireland, be their professions, be their opinions what they may, may freely meet in their own ancient, noble, historic University for the advancement of learning in that country. The removal of grievance is the negative portion of the project; the substantive and positive part of it, academic reform. We do not ask the House to embark upon a scheme which can be described as one of mere innovation. We ask you now to give to Ireland that which has been long desired, which has been often attempted, but which has never been attained; and we ask you to give it to Ireland, in founding yourselves upon the principles on which you have already acted in the Universities of England. We commit the plan to the prudence and the patriotism of this House, which we have so often experienced, and in which the country places, as we well know, an entire confidence. I will not lay stress upon the evils which will flow from its failure, from its rejection, in prolonging and embittering the controversies which have for many, for too many years been suffered to exist. I would rather dwell upon a more pleasing prospect—upon my hope, even upon my belief, that this plan in its essential features may meet with the approval of the House and of the country. At any rate, I am convinced that if it be your pleasure to adopt it, you will by its means enable Irishmen to raise their country to a height in the sphere of human culture such as will be worthy of the genius of the people, and such as may, perhaps, emulate those oldest, and possibly best, traditions of her history upon which Ireland still so fondly dwells.

## THE EASTERN QUESTION

MAY 7, 1877

In the spring of 1877 war was imminent between Russia and Turkey. The Prime Minister, Lord Beaconsfield, did not disguise his strong sympathy with Turkey, and his language led many people to believe that he contemplated intervention on behalf of that Power. To such a policy Gladstone was firmly opposed. He did not indeed hold that England had no concern in the question. On the contrary, he laid stress upon the responsibility for the better government of the Turkish Empire which devolved on this country as a consequence of having defended Turkey against Russia in the Crimean War. He considered that the best and only practicable method of discharging at that time the obligation thus incurred was to co-operate with Russia in enforcing suitable reforms upon the Porte. He believed that Turkey would not resist such a combination of great Powers, and therefore that the object could be attained without the use of force. He did not carry with him the whole of the Opposition, which was then led in the House of Commons by Lord Hartington. But he persevered with his policy, appealing to the country as a whole, and so far as he sought to prevent England from fighting for Turkey, he succeeded.

The following speech was made in support of a motion which declared that Turkey had by misconduct forfeited all claim to British support. For this motion the whole of the Liberal party voted. Gladstone had given notice of several others, which would have committed the Opposition to a definite policy of action for protecting the Christian subjects of the Sultan from oppression and tyranny. These he did not propose, abandoning them for the sake of harmony in the Liberal ranks. The speech, however, is an embodiment of his whole design, and contains a review of the Eastern Question from the beginning which is as searching and powerful as it is lofty and eloquent. It was delivered in arduous circumstances after tiresome preliminaries to an unfriendly House. It deserves to be recorded as a memorable example of intellectual vitality and moral courage.

It has also considerable value and importance from the strictly historical point of view. The relations between Russia and the Christian subjects of the Sultan came before the British House of Commons in the early days of Pitt's first Administration, and that powerful Minister, at the height of his fame, gave way before the resistance of Fox with a small minority of Whigs to British intervention on behalf of Turkey against the designs of the Czarina. Pitt found that with all his influence and authority he could not induce Parliament to strike a blow, or spend a shilling, for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in Europe. His own view seems to have been that Russia was becoming dangerous. But that view did not prevail, and indeed met with very little support. Canning, who was in many respects a pupil of Pitt, favoured the development of Greece, so long a province of Turkey, into an independent kingdom, and this result was achieved by the Battle of Navarino, fought in pursuance of Canning's policy a few

months after his death in 1827, when the Turkish fleet was destroyed by the combined navies of England and Russia. From the Treaty of Adrianople in 1828 to the Crimean War, which began in 1854, and ended in 1856, this country had altogether abandoned the idea of protecting Turkey, and Gladstone was able to show that since 1856 the rule of Turkey had rather deteriorated than improved.

**M**R. GLADSTONE, in rising to move the first of the Resolutions of which he had given Notice, as follows :—

“ That this House finds just cause of dissatisfaction and complaint in the conduct of the Ottoman Porte with regard to the despatch written by the Earl of Derby on the 21st of September, 1876, and relating to the massacres in Bulgaria,”—

said—

I much regret that I should introduce a subject of the greatest importance after discussions which must necessarily have had, I do not say an irritating, but a dissipating, effect upon the mind and attention of the House. Before approaching it I must deal with one or two preliminary matters.

My hon. friend the Member for Stafford<sup>1</sup> has spoken of the character of the manifestations which have recently proceeded from the country. I have watched the proceedings and read the declarations and conclusions arrived at steadily and regularly ; until to-day, when the number of meetings has entirely overpowered me, for, irrespective of other correspondence, the reports of nearly 100 meetings have reached me since this morning. As a matter of fact, having read all the resolutions passed at the previous meetings, and having even observed that from day to day their tone became warmer and warmer, I am bound to corroborate the statement of my hon. friend the Member for Stafford. In a very small number of these popular declarations, neutrality was either mentioned or implied. But I must add, again speaking simply to a matter of fact, though I put no particular construction on it, the reception of the Resolutions now before the House has been singularly different among the authorities that guide public opinion in the Metropolis, and those who address it in the country. Some of the greatest pundits of the Metropolis have been puzzled as to what my Resolutions mean ; and I am not sure that there is not a similar doubt and obscurity in the minds of Her Majesty's Government. The people of the country, however, do not appear to have experienced any portion of this

<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. Macdonald.

difficulty. I am able to say of all the resolutions at meetings held throughout the country, that in more than nineteen cases out of twenty their general scope has been in correspondence not merely with the first two of my five Resolutions, but with the whole. It is only fair to admit that I received an account of an adverse meeting held in the great town of Bradford; but it was the adverse meeting, not of the town of Bradford, but of the Executive Committee of the Conservative Association. I wish to give it its due publicity in order that such weight as it can fairly claim may be given to it. Now, though many of the declarations of opinion have come from Liberal Associations, yet also a large number have come from towns' meetings regularly summoned, and from other public meetings openly convened, largely attended at the very shortest notice, and pervaded by a spirit of enthusiasm equal to that which marked the expression of opinion in September. At one of these towns' meetings—that which was held in Northampton under the presidency of the Mayor—a gentleman moved a declaration to the effect that it would not be well to interfere with the action of Her Majesty's Government, and not a single person was found to second that motion. There is another town, and that is the town of Christchurch, represented by the hon. gentleman who is not now in his place<sup>1</sup>; he has wisely retired for the refreshment so necessary to us all for renewing the zeal and vigour of the inner man. Well, I am glad to think that the hon. gentleman who is about to move the Previous Question, if the Notice holds good, is or was entirely at one with me on the substance of this matter. I hold in my hand the report in a Conservative journal of the speech made by him at Christchurch in September, in which he declares positively that the Provinces of Turkey must be liberated; and, as the promises of its Government are worthless, there must be other guarantees. I am glad to see that in the town he represents a public meeting has been recently convened by the Mayor, and a requisition has been made to the hon. gentleman requesting him to support the Resolutions, the discussion of which he is about to stifle. The hon. Member will tell me if I misrepresent the case.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: The right hon. gentleman is misrepresenting the case. The persons who requested me to support the Resolutions were chiefly outside the borough, imported in wagons.

MR. GLADSTONE: The authentic organ of opinion in a borough

<sup>1</sup> Sir H. Drummond Wolff.

is a public meeting convened by the Mayor, and my statement is not weakened by the census the hon. gentleman has somewhat rapidly taken of the persons attending it, in a manner not, I think, the most complimentary to his constituents.

I now come, Sir, to the main question. These Resolutions would include, undoubtedly, a vital or material alteration of the declared policy of Her Majesty's Government. But my first object, and one of my main objects, is to clear that position of the Government in a most important respect. One of the points which I must endeavour, therefore, to establish is, that that position is at present ambiguous. Am I right in saying that, if this is so, it is desirable that their position should be cleared? I think I can show that I do not overstate the case. I do not propose to move a Vote of Censure on the Government, simply for this reason—that I do not see what public interest would be promoted by my doing it; but I wish to say in the calmest words—yet they cannot be weak words—that I know no chapter in the history of our foreign politics since the Peace of Vienna so deplorable as that of the last eighteen months. I speak of that policy generally. Some steps have been taken, especially the mission of Lord Salisbury to Constantinople, which deserved the approval of this House. But that step was immediately met on the part of the promoters of the Autumn movement by their reposing, at least provisionally, their confidence in the Ambassador, and by their abstaining from every step that could weaken his hands. They had to consider the mission in the light of the Guildhall speech. It was difficult to say how far it was modified by that extraordinary speech; but, notwithstanding, confidence in Lord Salisbury's purpose and views was the principle generally adopted, and upon that mission I have not now one word to say of censure, but only of commendation. But while he was at Constantinople there was also another Representative of England there, whose views upon the most vital questions were in direct opposition to those of Lord Salisbury. This utter difference of opinion, as we now know, was known to the Turkish Government, and it counteracted all along Lord Salisbury's efforts. This, then, is one of the points upon which the position of the Government is ambiguous and requires to be cleared.

Then, again, with regard to the withdrawal of Sir Henry Elliot from Constantinople at the close of the Conference. The conduct of the Porte had at that time deserved some manifestation of that feeling which it was reasonable for Her Majesty's Govern-

ment to entertain ; and all the other Powers had intelligibly shown their displeasure. But so far from displaying such a sentiment, Her Majesty's Government carefully made it known that the departure of Sir Henry Elliot was no sign of displeasure. Why was that done ? It brings into question, if not the sincerity of the Government, yet at the very least their firmness and clearness of purpose. Then, again, why was it that Her Majesty's Government, at the time of the Conference, made a communication to the Porte that the views of the Conference would be words, and words alone, and were not to be enforced either by Her Majesty's Government or with its approval ? It is a mild description of that proceeding to say that that rendered the policy and the position of Her Majesty's Government an ambiguous policy and position. You might as well have dismissed the Conference altogether. You might as well have done that which you seem given to do, and, at the outset of the proceedings of that European Parliament, have moved the " Previous Question." The Conference was idle ; the Conference became a farce from the moment when Turkey had been informed by England that in no circumstances would she either herself enforce, or recognize the enforcement by others of, the decisions at which the Conference might arrive. Why, Sir, what was the position of the case ? England was then the sole obstacle to a policy that would have given reality to the decisions that Lord Salisbury had laboured so gallantly to promote. But, like the power behind the Throne in other days, there was somewhere or other a power behind Lord Salisbury which determined that he should not succeed. And, consequently, at a very early date in the proceedings the Porte was informed on this vital matter. Why was the Porte informed of it ? Why was the Porte informed of it then ? When was Lord Salisbury made aware of it ? Did he know it before he left England ? (THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER <sup>1</sup>: Yes.) Ah ! he did ? He knew that he was to be allowed to use words, and words alone ? Did he know it before he accepted the mission ? My question now is whether, when Lord Salisbury left England, and not only when he left England, but when he accepted the mission and allowed himself to be proclaimed Ambassador, he had been made aware by his colleagues that the words which he might use, and the decisions at which the Conference might arrive, were to be recommendations simply, and were in no circumstances to be imposed upon

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

the Porte ? To that I have no answer. I must answer it for myself. But, whether Lord Salisbury was aware of the intention or not, why was that communication made to the Porte before the proceedings of the Conference ? Why was that communication made, which drew forth a lively expression of the gratitude of the Grand Vizier and of the Turkish Government, not to the British Government at large, but to Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Derby ? Was the same thing done by other Governments ? The Austrian Government, on the contrary, knowing perfectly well with whom they had to deal, had declared that when the decisions of the Conference were arrived at they ought to be imposed upon the Porte by a naval demonstration ; and, unless I am much mistaken, it was well known to the Government of Her Majesty that in the opinion of the Government of France the Conference was an idle form if the Porte was to be apprised that force was not to be used with respect to the recommendations of Europe. Therefore, we find Her Majesty's Government, by their unhappy act, playing the evil genius of Europe, and at the most critical moment taking the very step that was certain, in the opinion of the best and most experienced judges, to nullify and frustrate utterly the labours they were ostensibly undertaking. It is a mild description to say that this rendered the position of the Government an ambiguous position.

I am bound to say I think the mission of Mr. Layard has, in its outward aspect, the same effect. I carefully abstain from pronouncing a final judgment upon it. I do not desire to make it a subject of censure. I have known Mr. Layard in two capacities. I have known Mr. Layard when I last held Office under the Crown. I then knew him as the able and zealous Representative of this country at Madrid, discharging his duties in a manner that gave to the late Ministry the most perfect satisfaction. But I cannot altogether set aside my recollections of Mr. Layard in this House, when he was by far the most effective, and by far the furthest-going advocate of the Government of Turkey whom I have ever known to sit on these benches. Consequently, as we find in the Blue Book which was presented to us on Saturday, the appointment of Mr. Layard was again selected as a special subject of thanks by the Turkish Government, and it was acknowledged in a peculiar and very appropriate phrase to be on the part of the Government of Her Majesty, inasmuch as they knew his friendly sentiments towards Turkey, a " delicate attention." A " delicate attention " to that Government which has

made itself responsible in full from first to last for the massacres of Bulgaria, and whose fixed intention is that on similar occasion similar massacres should again be perpetrated. "Delicate attentions" to that Government from the Government of Her Majesty are matters which, if not wrong in themselves, at least require some elucidation to show that their position with regard to the crimes of that Government is not an ambiguous position.

Again, Sir, it will be remembered that a dispatch was produced to us in the month of May last year, in which it was stated that Her Majesty's Government felt that Turkey was only to depend upon their moral support. Now my second Resolution, which is regarded by the Secretary for War as of so neutral and imperative a character, carefully states that Turkey has lost all claim to either the material or the moral support of Great Britain. The lines between material and moral support are not always easily drawn. What kind of support did Her Majesty's Government give to Turkey last year when, having sent a squadron to Besika Bay to protect Christian life, they afterwards converted that squadron into a powerful fleet for some other unacknowledged purpose? What kind of support, I say, was the support then given to Turkey? Her Majesty's Government, as far as my knowledge goes, have never disclaimed this ill-omened phrase "moral support." I do not want to pin them to it—God forbid! I wish with all my soul that they may disclaim it; but I wish also to point out that, as far as I know, it has not yet been disclaimed.

What may not be done under the name of "moral support"? Why, almost as much as may be done under the name of "British interests." We sent that fleet to Besika Bay, or, at least, we made that squadron into a fleet when it was in Besika Bay; and what was the effect of the presence of that fleet? I say, without the least hesitation, it was to overawe the Provinces of Turkey bordering on the Archipelago and the Kingdom of free Greece, and to prevent any movement which might have been made in sympathy with the Slav Provinces. And, therefore, although without lifting a hand, it was material as well as moral support that was supplied to Turkey under the name of moral support, for it prevented from pouring into the field those who would have added to the force of Turkey's rebellious subjects.

I venture to say that there is a greater ambiguity still, and a more prolific source of it, than those to which I have already referred; it is to be found in the conflicting declarations of Her

Majesty's Government. Having recognized the mission of Lord Salisbury as a kind of point of junction at which we, who had taken part in the popular movement, were able to bring ourselves into a sort of union with Her Majesty's Government, I will go back to nothing in the conduct of the Government which preceded that mission, and thereby I shall get rid of a great deal of awkward matter spoken at Aylesbury and elsewhere. I will not draw a comparison between those speeches, and other speeches which gave some public satisfaction, and tended greatly to arrest the movement which was in progress in the country. I take only what has happened in England since the despatch of September 21 to the Conference at Constantinople. I am bound to say I cannot do otherwise than recognize the most distinct retrogression in the policy of Her Majesty's Government since the closing of the Conference. I also find contradictions which I at least am wholly unable to reconcile in the declarations of the Government. I take first one declaration, which I think ought to be borne in mind, though I do not dwell upon it, because I do not wish to make it a matter of controversy. There was a declaration by Sir Henry Elliot that it did not signify, so far as the main question was concerned, what number of Bulgarians were massacred, because the thing essential for us to do was to maintain our vital interests in the Ottoman Empire. Lord Derby very properly rebuked and repudiated that declaration in his despatch of the 21st of September; where, after describing the outrages which had occurred, and the countenance given to them, he said that no interests whatever could possibly justify acquiescence in the continuance of such a system. That was a sharp antagonism between Minister and Ambassador. But I want to know which of these two conflicting authorities is to come uppermost in the long run. No doubt the authority of Lord Derby is the greater. I am certain that what he wrote he wrote with sincerity. But if I am to look at the tone and tenor of the declarations of the Government for the last two or three months, I am sorry to say that they seem to me to be relapsing into a position in which the outrages inflicted by the Government of Turkey are to be contemplated as matters of sentimental regret, and for idle and verbal expostulations; but in which action is to be determined by whatever we may choose to think to be British interests. That is to say, that our opinion of what we think best for ourselves is, after all, to be, in substance, our measures of right and wrong all over the world. I want to know whether that contradiction sub-

sists, or whether we still have to learn that there is to be no toleration for iniquity, and that no continuance of material or of moral support is to be given to a Government which is so deeply dyed with the guilt of these outrages.

Next I come to a declaration of Lord Carnarvon. There is not a single utterance which has proceeded from the mouth of any Member of Her Majesty's Government that served the purposes of the Government better at the time than this manly speech of Lord Carnarvon. What did he say? I will not quote him at length, but he said—

“He did not disagree, if he rightly understood it, with the public feeling and opinion, because it had been somewhat loudly expressed, and because here and there there might have been some exaggerations. He thought, on the contrary, it was a credit to the country. He rejoiced that there was neither delay nor hesitation in the expression of that feeling, and, so far from weakening the hands of the Government, he believed that, if rightly understood at home and abroad, nothing could more strengthen the hands of his noble friend the Foreign Secretary than the burst of indignation which had just gone through the length and breadth of the land.”

That was the declaration of Lord Carnarvon. No contradiction to it was given by any Member of the Government at the time. But what has been done lately? The noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in a place which I need not name—his words, wherever they may be spoken, are too important not to excite attention—described the sentiment of the British people, manifested last Autumn, as a “got-up” sentiment—we know what is contained in these words—and expressed it to be his opinion that the effect of it had been mischievous. He thus spoke in direct contradiction of that declaration of Lord Carnarvon; for which, when I just now read it, I was sorry to observe there was not from the other side of the House a solitary cheer. On the first night of the Session, when this retrogression of which I complain had hardly begun to develop itself, my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>1</sup> made a declaration on the subject of the Turkish Constitution, which I heard with the greatest pleasure, but for which he was, I think, severely rebuked by some of the organs of the Turkish Government in the London Press. He earned the rebuke by speaking, as he did speak, the language of good sense about the Turkish Constitution, which he described as a thing in which no sensible man could place the slightest reliance. In doing that he did not go beyond, but remained completely within, the shadow of that most masterly

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

Paper in which Lord Salisbury—as may be seen from the Blue Book—had torn the Turkish Constitution into rags, and held it up to the contempt and derision of mankind. It is, indeed, a device—first and foremost, to delude Western Europe by a show of freedom, and, secondly, to organize, and thereby strengthen the oppressive force which bears down the subject-races. But is that the tone now? Read the despatch of Lord Derby to Prince Gortchakoff, which we have received to-day. All is changed. You will find that there Her Majesty's Government says plainly that Turkey should be allowed time to reform herself, and that it is not reasonable to abandon the hope of complete and satisfactory relief to the subjects of the Porte, inasmuch as Turkey has promised that reform. But I will quote once more, as it appears to me, a clear and distinct contradiction. My right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>1</sup> told us on a former and not very late occasion that it was a very great hardship to Turkey that she should be complained of for not reforming herself when a war cloud was hanging over her. He said it was a time when it was almost impossible to apply moral pressure to her; and he went on to explain that, in his view, the presence of a Russian army on her frontier made her position one of great difficulty, by appealing to those principles of honour which are supposed to be so highly refined and polished in the Turkish mind. My right hon. friend distinctly pointed to the Russian armaments as having been an obstacle in the way of the Conference at Constantinople, and as having cut off the hopes of its success; but in saying that he is in direct and diametrical contradiction to Lord Salisbury. Lord Salisbury has publicly declared, and his words cannot be subjected to question, that the Russian armament, on the contrary, constituted the hope of the Conference. I will not trouble the House with lengthened quotations; but Lord Salisbury in substance said that he knew very well that mere words were useless; nay, worse than useless, because delusive, and that it was to the Russian armaments, and the consequent danger to Turkey, and the power of pointing out that danger before her eyes, that the Representatives of the other Powers of the Conference attached their whole hope of inducing Turkey to acquiesce in their conclusions. Even with that advantage, acquiesce she would not. Thus, again, we have important Members of the Government making statements which entirely contradict one another on vital points of the case. And

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

now, this very day, we have the despatch to Prince Gortchakoff, justly hailed with delight by the so-called friends of Turkey. I am not surprised at it, for there is no mistaking the tone of that despatch. In its tone and its tendency it is redolent all through of moral support, it is charged with moral support, and, unless the Government thinks fit to give us some explanation of it which will relieve our minds, we challenge them in this House to-night to have it declared authoritatively whether Turkey has, or has not, lost all claim to our moral as well as our material support.

The House will well recollect the whole line of argument which was pursued by the Government both for some time before and also during the sittings of the Conference. It had become as clear as possible that Turkey had at all times been a country fertile beyond any other in promises. No man knew that better than the right hon. gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department,<sup>1</sup> when he aptly compared her promises to inconvertible paper, and said that we must have sterling metal. Necessary guarantees, something beyond mere promises, adequate securities, consisting in something beyond and above the engagements or ostensible proceedings of the Turkish Government constituted indeed the pith of the extracts which were read by the Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>2</sup> on the first night of the Session from the Instructions to Lord Salisbury. Well, what has now become of those necessary guarantees? They are all gone to the winds. We are told in the despatch published this morning that we are to found our hopes on the fact that the Porte has promised certain things, and that as it has promised we cannot be sure that it will not perform. This is the vital point; it lies at the root of the whole matter. We are now told to rely on those promises. But, for my own part, I would repeat what I said on a former occasion, when we were trying remonstrance after remonstrance, and protestation after protestation. Those protestations, and those remonstrances, and those representations which have been lavished in such redundancy on the Porte by Her Majesty's Government, are all very well up to a certain point; up to the point at which there remains some semblance of a reasonable hope that they may possibly attain their end. But it is not so, when we have found by long and wide experience that they produce no substantial result whatever. It was not thus always; for in the time of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, a man of masterly ability, of iron will, and of a character which did not admit of his being

<sup>1</sup> Sir Richard Assheton-Cross.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

trifled with, something was done in a few points by the Porte, and some improvements, on certain points, were effected in the condition of its people. But during all these later years, the case has not stood so well. With regard to remonstrances made in the time of the late Government, they were not very numerous, for no great crisis occurred in Turkey and the matters reported were, I believe, comparatively rare. Recently the case has been different. With regard to these remonstrances, which, since the rebellion in her Provinces, have become much more numerous, our experience has been so unbroken and unvarying that the man who persists in a system of mere remonstrances and mere expostulations, really seems to convict himself, either of insincerity, which is not for a moment to be imputed here, or of a total incapacity to understand the affairs with which he has to deal.

I have spoken, then, of contrariety in the declarations of Members of the Government, and of the extremely ambiguous position in which it stands with respect to this question. I think we are entitled to ask that all this ambiguity may be cleared away, and that we may be permitted to know whether after all that has happened we are still to rely on Turkish propositions, and still to afford to the Sultan a moral support. Going outside the Government, I now come to the language of its adherents in the Press and in the country. There never has been a time when I have heard so much of direct communications between the Government and the Metropolitan Press as within the last eighteen months ; and my belief is that at no time has it been so constant and unfailing. What the tone of the prints is which are supposed to enjoy the privilege of these communications, every one who hears me is aware. I do not hesitate to say that the language which is held among the supporters of the Government in the society of London, and by that portion of the Press which has taken what I may call the Turkish side of this matter—I say which is called the Turkish side, because I believe those of whom I am speaking, and who suppose that they are acting a friendly part towards Turkey, are all the time driving her on to utter ruin—is language, the purpose of which, distinct and unconcealed, is to prepare the public mind for war. And for what war? Not for war under the name of war on the side of Turkey, but for a war to be undertaken under some shadowy pretext of a British interest. Now, what are British interests? and for what purpose is that phrase brought into incessant use? The phrase itself is

the most elastic in the world. Consider the position of this Empire. Consider how from this little Island we have stretched out our arms into every portion of the world. Consider how we have conquered, planted, annexed, and appropriated at all the points of the compass, so that at few points on the surface of the earth is there not some region or some spot of British dominion near at hand. Nor even from these few points are we absent. Consider how our commerce finds its way into every port which a ship can enter. And then I ask you what quarrel can arise between any two countries, or what war, in which you may not, if you be so minded, set up British interests as a ground of interference. That is the case of India in particular. We go to the other end of the world as a company of merchants ; we develop the arts and arms of conquerors ; we rule over a vast space of territory containing 200,000,000 people, and what do we say next ? We lay a virtual claim to a veto upon all the political arrangements of all the countries and seas which can possibly constitute any one of the routes between England and the East, between two extremities, or nearly such, of the world. We say to one State—You must do nothing in the Black Sea at Batoum, because Batoum and Erzeroum may one day become a route to the East. We say—You must do nothing in Syria or Bagdad, because we may finally discover the Valley of the Euphrates to be the best route to the East. The Suez Canal was made for the benefit of the world ; but it is thought by some of these pretenders that we, who almost furiously opposed the digging of it, have rights there which are quite distinct in kind from those of the rest of the world, and that we are entitled to assert our mastery without regard to the interests of other portions of mankind. Then there is the route by the Cape of Good Hope. It happens, however, that at the Cape no one annexes but ourselves. Nay, it appears from news no older than to-day, that we are so stinted in our possessions that it is expedient to make large additions to our territory there ; and to make them exactly by those menaces of force which Ministers think so intolerable in the case of Turkey. And then you know, Mr. Speaker, that any additions to our territory are always perfectly innocent. Sometimes they may be made not without bloodshed ; sometimes they are made not without a threat of bloodshed. But that is not our fault ; it is only due to the stupidity of those people who cannot perceive the wisdom of coming under our sceptre. We are endowed with a superiority of character, a noble unselfishness, an inflexible integrity which

the other nations of the world are too slow to recognize ; and they are stupid enough to think that we—superior beings that we are—are to be bound by the same vulgar rules that might be justly applicable to the ordinary sons of Adam. Now I do not hesitate to say that, in the particular case of the Eastern Question, nothing is wanted but right conduct on the part of the Government to give the greatest dignity, as well as the greatest security, to the position of this country. We have improperly allowed the vindication of the great cause in the East to pass into the hands of a single Power. It is true that, by the mouth of Lord Derby, the nation has been made to speak that which by its own mouth it does not, and would not speak at all. He has rebuked a single Power, and has cast upon that single Power the responsibility of consequences, because it has made itself the organ of the collective will, the united judgment, and the solemn conclusions of Europe. That is the course which we have taken, and that is a dangerous course. We ought to view with regret and misgiving anything that puts a single Power in a position to take such a charge upon herself, and most of all in the case of a Power like Russia, which, as a neighbouring Power, has special temptations in matters of this kind. Such a Power as Russia, and I must add, such a Power as Austria, has of necessity special temptations in this case ; and it can never be satisfactory to me to see the subject settled either by Russia, or by Austria, or by Russia with Austria. But the question remains—How are these terrible evils, which afflict Turkey and disgrace Europe, to be met ? Are they to be met by remonstrances and expostulations only ? The answer echoed back from the Ministerial benches is—“By remonstrances and expostulations only.” Now that, I believe, human nature, the conscience of mankind, and the civilization of the nineteenth century, will no longer bear. If you are not prepared to carry further that united action of Europe in which you seemed to engage, but which you defeated by your ill-judged proceedings, you must expect to see it pass into the hands of others, and your remonstrances and your cavils at others will not be appreciated by the general sentiment of the world until you are able to show that you are yourselves ready to enter into some honourable combination for the purpose of applying an effectual remedy to the evil.

Now, Sir, I pass from this general argument to the first Resolution, and to Lord Derby's despatch. That despatch involved one of two things. It was either a declaration that ought to have

been followed up, or else it was a gross and unwarrantable insult to Turkey. There is no escape from the dilemma. You have no right to go about flinging those violent words in the face of any Power, unless that Power has made itself a criminal before Europe ; and if that Power is to have your moral support, you have certainly no right to use such language. You were bound either to tear that despatch into shreds, or to go further in your own vindication. The language of that despatch was as strong as the language used at any of the meetings held last Autumn. In substance, it demanded reparation for the past and security for the future. I have read carefully to-day Mr. Baring's Report on the Bulgarian massacres. Remember it is now twelve months since those Bulgarian massacres occurred. What has been the position of the Turkish Government in relation to this question ? Those massacres occurred in May, but it was three months afterwards before the first intimation reached the other Governments. What had the Turkish Government done during those three months ? They had simply been engaged in wholesale imprisonment of Bulgarians in foul and loathsome dens, in bringing them to trial, and in directing scores of executions. That was the view of the Turkish Government with regard to the massacres ; and they had not, even at this date, attained to a right conception of the ideas of Europe upon these most guilty transactions, and upon their own complicity in them. Lord Derby demanded that the authors of the massacres should be punished ; and this, and the demand for reparation, were the main points of the despatch. We are now in the month of May. Let us see what has been done. Mr. Baring tells us that very great progress has been made in rebuilding the villages—with the forced labour of the people themselves—that many of the women and girls have been returned, and that a few of the cattle have been recovered. These are the substantive results of the despatch. These things have, however, nothing to do with the policy of the massacres, nor do they touch in the slightest degree our principal demands. But what has happened as to the punishment of the offenders and the reward of well-doers ? I must go, however briefly, over these particulars of the conduct of the Turkish Government, because it forms the ground for the first two Resolutions which I ask the House to adopt. The despatch of Lord Derby has been, in the main points, treated with contempt. I do not discuss the prudence of that despatch—I hold it to be in various points far from prudent—but has the conduct of the guilty persons been

approved and rewarded by the Turkish Government, or have they been marked out for condign punishment, as Lord Derby, speaking for the Queen, demanded? Shefket Pasha, Toussoon Pasha, and Achmet Aga have not been executed. One of them was not tried; one tried and acquitted; one tried and condemned, but his sentence was not executed. It is an absolute mockery to which we have been submitted. I believe I may say that not one considerable man has had any sentence whatever executed against him. One or two nameless and insignificant individuals have been put to death, whether on account of these massacres does not very clearly appear; but the chief agents have escaped with perfect impunity, and decorations and rewards have been given to many of them. And, finally, of those good Mahommedans, who at the hazard of their lives interfered in the interests of humanity and justice, every one has been either punished by dismissal, or else remains to this hour unrewarded.

In the first place, there is everything short of absolute proof that these massacres were originally designed. If they were not, why were the Bashi Bazouks employed for their suppression? Yet I do not mean to imply that the employment of the Regulars would have afforded a security against outrage. On the contrary, they committed on many occasions gross cruelty and outrage. Yet they were, on the whole, far behind the incredible fury and wickedness of the Bashi Bazouks. Again, why were the Mussulman population armed? There is no sufficient answer. There was war. Yes, but the war did not occur for two months after. There was a rebellion in the small province of Herzegovina. But there were Turkish troops there to deal with the rebellion. It was a wanton and wilful act on the part of Turkey to arm those irregular troops. The extraordinary excuse you find in some passages of those Blue Books is, that there were Russian agents who suggested it to the Turks in order to cause the massacres that ensued. There is no proof, I know, of such a suggestion; still such is the allegation. But even if that were the case, does that diminish the guilt of the Turk? Not by a single hair's-breadth. I admit that the question is wrapped in mystery, and that we can only judge of facts; but this we know—that after the massacres, and when the Turkish Government was well informed of them, they proceeded not to punish the perpetrators, but to imprison and hang more Bulgarians; and that, when a stir began to be made in Europe, illusory inquiries were set on foot, and that from these inquiries there proceeded reports which

it is idle to describe except in plain words as lying reports. They are described as lying reports by the Consul of the United States ; and in language exactly equivalent, though rather more civil, by Mr. Baring and Sir Henry Elliot, as, I think, utterly untrustworthy reports. When the stir was made in this country and elsewhere, which Lord Derby says was got up, and did so much mischief, he wrote the despatch to which I have referred, and he now deplores the agitation which led him to write it. Well, what was done ? A Commission was appointed with much solemn form ; but care was taken to pack that Commission, partly at the time and partly later on, with men considered safe. So, that while one or two good men were members of it, they should be always in a minority. The result is that, instead of affording redress, it has added infinitely to the disgrace of Turkey : by its delays, by violence, by obstruction, by intimidation, by what it has done, and by what it has not done ; finally, by those acquittals which caused at last Mr. Baring's indignant withdrawal from a scene where he did not wish or could not bear longer to witness a prostitution of justice. Well, we know what has been done as to Shefket Pasha and the rest. Why is it that the offenders named in the Papers laid before us remain unpunished ? It is because these miscreants possessed instructions to act as they did from persons still higher in the Ottoman Government. These persons in high places, it is now too plain, directed these outrages, for which a show was made in some instances of trying the perpetrators, and in other instances apologies were made for failure to apprehend them. Every portion of the conduct of Turkey in regard to these massacres possesses a dramatic unity and integrity. I make bold, without asking the House to hear the repetition of the numerous details, to say that I have myself demonstrated it, in a tract now before the world, and founded on the highest evidence. Follow it out. Examine it carefully. Everything comes home to the door of the Porte itself. Even if Shefket Pasha had been punished, why should the tool only be punished, and not also the hand that used it ? And yet not only is not that the case, but we find Abdul Kerim, the man who gave him the instruction, appointed to the highest command of the Turkish Army now massed on the Danube. It seems almost idle to argue in the face of the evidence we have in reference to these cases ; and the Blue Book just placed in our hands has added new horrors to those with which we were before but too abundantly supplied. It will be remembered that, as a refine-

ment of wickedness unknown anywhere else in the world, Consul Schuyler charged upon Selim Effendi, who was employed in these inquiries, that he tortured prisoners in prison to compel them to give evidence of such a kind as suited his purpose. Selim Effendi addressed a letter to me, as I had referred to the charge, and said that it was very hard upon him to be made the subject of such an accusation, that all the proceedings in the Court were perfectly open, and that nothing of the kind could have, or had occurred. But the charge was not as to what had occurred in the Court ; it related to what had occurred secretly in prison. He answered the charge which was not made, and passed by the charge that was made. In reply to his letter, which was perfectly becoming and courteous, I addressed a letter to him, and pointed out this fact ; adding that he would doubtless answer the charge, which rested on the authority of Mr. Schuyler. Well, that was four months ago, and not another word have I heard from or of him.

We have, Sir, other cases of a most loathsome and revolting kind in the Blue Book that has been recently placed before us, as to which an English Vice-Consul says, at page 46 of the Blue Book circulated May 5, that the evidence left him absolutely no room to doubt ; and of these he gives the most painful and horrible details. I will not dwell upon them, but, as the volume is in the hands of Members, will spare them the pain. Suffice it to say that they were systematically carried on by Suleiman Aga. When the facts were made known, how was he punished ? He was deprived of his sword for three days ; and was then consoled by being retained in his office of Chief of Police, which he holds to this day. The Vice-Consul gives an account which shows that these tortures were inflicted on the people, and especially on the priests to make them give particular evidence.

Suffice it, Sir, on the whole to say that the evidence, of which I have here given but a few points, when taken together, is conclusive. The outrages and massacres in Bulgaria were not the acts of the Bashi Bazouks, or the Regulars, or of the Mussulman population, except as mere instruments of the Porte. As instruments they are guilty, and as instruments alone. These massacres were not accident, they were not caprice, they were not passion. They were system, they were method, they were policy, they were principle. They were the things done in Damascus in 1860 ; and I may say that the Liberal Government of that day took up those massacres in a very different manner from that in

which Her Majesty's Government has proceeded ; so that, under the pressure then exerted by the European Powers, the Porte was compelled to hang a Pasha. Like deeds were also done during the Greek Revolution ; and again and again they will be done, until the Turkish Government finds that there is some adequate authority determined to say that they shall not be done again.

If these things cannot be denied—and I know they cannot be denied—are we to continue this miserable farce—for so I must call it, since this it appears to have become—of expostulation ? You do not expostulate with malefactors in your own country—you punish them. The Home Secretary would consider it a senseless proceeding to expostulate with a murderer, and ask him not to commit such a crime again ; or even to protest against his committing it. But with respect to Turkey we know exactly the process, and how it is managed from beginning to end. When there occurs some crime or outrage, if there are not foreign agents near, no notice is taken of it, provided a Mahomedan be the guilty part. If it be a Christian, it is a very different matter. For example, you will find in these papers an account of a Turkish boy who seriously wounded a Christian woman. She was pregnant, and she was seemingly about to die ; but the report of the Consul is that unfortunately there was no law in the country by which the Turkish boy, being only a boy, could be punished. Would that apply to a Christian boy ? In Miss Mackenzie's and Miss Irby's most sensible and dispassionate work, you will find an account of a struggle between a Turkish boy and a Christian boy. They fought desperately. The Christian boy fought in self-defence. They were both so much injured that they kept their beds for several weeks. The Turkish boy died, and what happened ? There was plenty of law to be found then. The Christian boy was condemned to be hanged ; and the Grand Vizier, who was travelling through the Province, delayed his departure in order to see him executed ; and thus he gives the Christians a solemn warning of the consequences that would follow their resisting injury. One and the same lesson runs through all these transactions. " You rayahs are allowed not to enjoy life, but to live. Your tribute is the condition of your life. You must take your life on the conditions we name ; and if you raise your hand—it may be to secure justice by force—you will be the subject of crimes and outrages which, whatever their nature may be, will become virtue and public service when com-

mitted for the sake of maintaining Ottoman dominion over the unbeliever whom he has a right to rule." What I have said may sound like exaggeration. It is no such thing. It is, I maintain, a plain matter-of-fact description of the way in which Turkish power has been maintained. Nay, more ; it is the way in which alone this unnatural domination can be maintained, with ever-increasing difficulty, and upon occasion with ever-increasing horror, until the day of its doom shall come.

I pointed out last year that in the Autumn of 1875 a body of Herzegovinian refugees had been invited to go back to their homes. In an evil hour they accepted the invitation, and returned, escorted, as they had taken unusual precautions, by a force of Turkish Regular troops ; but they were massacred by some of the Boys, their Mussulman landlords. It was done in the sight of the escort ; and the escort raised not a finger in their defence. This was at a time when the Turkish Government and Mr. Consul Holmes were inviting the refugees to return home. The facts were made known to Lord Derby ; he addressed to the proper authorities an indignant despatch, demanding that there should be an inquiry, followed by punishment of the offenders and redress to the injured persons. No further notice has, however, been taken of the matter. His despatch remains like water poured out upon the sand. There was probably a promise of inquiry ; this is one of the usual shifts ; and I may state, on the authority of Mr. Baring's last Report, that this is the uniform course pursued by the Turkish authorities.

What I want to know therefore is, whether we are to continue to make ourselves ridiculous, and at the same time utterly to delude the world by what the Government is pleased to call remonstrating upon these subjects. This matter grows worse and worse. We have in the Papers which were delivered to us a few days back a new crop of horrors reported from Erzeroum, as having occurred no longer ago than on the 14th of March. A body of troops went into a village and demanded food and money. Their demands were, of course, complied with. They then proceeded to maltreat the men, and to violate the women and girls, several of whom died in consequence of the treatment to which they were subjected. On this occasion again an energetic telegram was despatched in the first instance. Afterwards Lord Derby spoke with bated breath, and desired that the attention of the Porte " might be called " to the matter. It mattered not a straw whether his language was strong or weak. It is the old

story. As on the previous occasion, nothing came of his demand. My contention is that this conduct is not compatible with the decency of the case or with the honour of England ; and that if no result is to follow upon communications of the kind to which I allude they ought not to be made. It is bad enough to say that you will take no notice of crimes such as those ; but it is worse to notice them in a way which you know full well can produce no result, yet which deludes this country and the world by seeming to promise one, and by making a vain show of interest in the condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte.

Passing to the second of my Resolutions, let me refer to the daring assertion which has been made by the opponents of the subject-races, that the outrages have ceased. We have had no Papers given us for three months ; and the Papers which were circulated so lately as the day before yesterday, supply us with no recent intelligence upon the subject. I take, however, such rather stale intelligence as they do give. The only evidence which the Government has afforded to us on the point shows that up to the 20th of February last the same atrocious and horrible state of things, concerning which complaints had been previously made, continued in Bulgaria. In those Papers Mr. Baring states that the lives and property of Christians were scarcely safer at the end of February than they were in May of last year. I ask the House, then, to support the Resolution which alleges that the Porte has lost all claim to our moral as well as our material support.

Shall I be told, that we have withdrawn from Turkey our moral as well as our material support ? This is a point at present very doubtful, which ought to be made clear. It is true that we have denounced the perpetrators of these outrages. I say we have denounced the wrong people. These perpetrators were only tools. That they were tools only, is demonstrated by the fact that they remain unpunished, free, rewarded, decorated. Why is this ? Because they acted in obedience to orders—written orders in some cases—and from the highest authorities. I have spoken of Abdul Kerim ; but unless other high personages are very much calumniated, they too are implicated in the guilt of these proceedings. Assuredly, no name is more odious than the name of Midhat Pasha to the Christians of Bulgaria. There is in Turkey an admittedly intolerable Government. Has it improved during the last quarter of a century ? I am responsible for one, for having then believed, on the great authority of Lord

Palmerston, and on the even higher authority of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, that its Government might be improved. Some men, with deeper insight than that possessed at the time by any politician, knew that the case was hopeless. A quarter of a century ago, however, we thought that we ought not to despair of the improvement of Turkey, as long as a ray of hope remained. Since then a time surely sufficient for trial has elapsed, during which perfect peace has been secured for Turkey from without, and she has had no evils or mischiefs to deal with, except those provoked and promoted by her own gross and monstrous misgovernment. But have things improved in Turkey in that period? I believe that, upon the whole, instead of improving, they have become worse. I do not, of course, question the local improvements, which have been the result of an increase in the number of Consuls and Foreign Agents; because wherever a Consul or a Foreign Agent resides, there is usually a little precinct formed, within which comparative security is enjoyed. Nor do I doubt that here and there some partial, indecisive measures have been adopted for the purpose of putting into execution a portion of the promises of the Porte. But since 1854 there has been in Turkey a great increase in the centralization of the Ottoman system, and in the taxation; and a multiplication of the agents of the Government in the persons of those whom it is a mockery to call police. The result has been that there has been an aggravation of Mohammedan as well as Christian grievances; and there is far more discontent among the Mussulman inhabitants of Turkey now, than existed a quarter of a century ago. Mr. Baring, in referring to the Turkish police, states that they are little or no better than organized bands of brigands. But this Force, which is one of the greatest curses of the country, is a Force which does not belong to the older Ottoman system. Again, of late, Turkey has acquired a passion for a National Debt, for large standing armies, for iron-clad fleets, and for improved arms; and the result has been that a great increase of revenue was necessary. It has been raised in a disproportionate degree from the Christian Slav Provinces, and it is this endeavour to obtain an enormous revenue which has been one of the greatest curses of the country. (The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER<sup>1</sup>: Hear, hear!) The right hon. gentleman cheers that statement. But what remedy is he prepared to propose for this state of things? Why, he is prepared to look on and to expostulate. I

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

say that it is better, it is more honest, not to look on, and to withhold this expostulation, rather than to profess our interest and to pursue a method such as the one now in use. And here I may, perhaps, be allowed to offer a suggestion to the right hon. gentleman. Why should he not prepare printed forms of expostulation? There might be blanks for the number of villages burnt, for the number of men killed, and for the number of women violated; and there ought to be another blank to be filled up as occasion required by the word "expostulate," or "represent," or "regret," or, if necessary, "protest." This would save a considerable amount of labour at the Foreign Office, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as the sovereign guardian of the public purse, might really, by the simple means that I suggest, effect some reduction in the cost of that establishment. This is a sorry subject on which to jest. But it is the Government who have made a sorry jest of a matter in itself very solemn. It is a sorry jest constantly to reiterate expostulations of this character with the knowledge founded on long experience, that as a general rule they will work without being followed by any result. The Porte, which well understands the force of words, knows that our expostulations begin in words and that they end in words; and it is time that the people of England and the people of Turkish Christian Provinces should begin to understand as much.

It appears to me that if Her Majesty's Government desired really to pursue an effective policy, they should have gone further than I have yet indicated; but they would have done a great deal if they had gone as far as I have hitherto suggested. They would have conveyed an amount of confidence to the minds of the people of this country which they are now very far from feeling.

But, Sir, in my opinion, a just denunciation of outrages which former events had placed within our cognizance, and a real, not an equivocal withdrawal of support from Turkey, though they are more than we can yet be sure of having obtained, are very far from filling up the measure of our duties and our honourable obligations. I argue that we ought to use our influence in the great Council of Europe for the effectual deliverance of these Provinces from oppression, but not for their transfer to any foreign dominion. Now, it is a foreign agency, not under our control, to which we have chosen to make over the fulfilment of engagements which are ours. I must, therefore, consider our

relation to that foreign Power. We need entertain no fear at all that the action of Russia in the present effort will endanger British interests. Russia is not mad enough to touch British interests in the execution of the purpose she has in hand. We have, however, given Russia a magnificent opportunity, of which she can avail herself, to plead truly that what she asks is what Europe asks ; and the difference between her and other nations is that they are content to put up with, and she is not content to put up with, Turkey's infatuated refusal to give securities for the improvement of her Government. You may say that she is pursuing selfish objects ; but, if that be true, that is an additional condemnation of your policy, because if she was untrustworthy, why did you leave her to act alone and unrestrained in accomplishing this work ? I had hoped that Her Majesty's Government might even have been disposed to have accompanied me thus far, and that we might all look forward to the establishment in these Provinces of local self-government and local liberty, and so saving them from transfer to any other foreign dominion. In this, as in other hopes, I am baffled ; and instead of a wise co-operation in this endeavour to effect a great good, I am called upon to consider the misdeeds of Russia. We are told that Russia has been guilty of the greatest cruelties in Poland. I hear hon. Members opposite cheering that statement ; but no cheers came from that quarter of the House when, at the time those cruelties were being committed in Poland, remonstrances against them were moved from this side of the House. I put aside, for the present, cases in which the tongue of calumny has been busy, or cases in which there may be a doubt about the facts. Apart from such cases, there have been at least two occasions on which, in my view, the conduct of that Power cannot be defended. The first occasion was when the Emperor Nicholas took up arms to put down by force Hungarian liberties—the liberties of those Hungarians who, at the time, were very anxious to interest the world in their own affairs, but who do not now appear desirous of extending those liberties to others ; a fact which, had we known at the time it was to occur, might have somewhat modified our feelings in their favour. The claims of those Hungarians, however, were at the time just, and we thought that the proceedings of the Emperor of Russia, who lent to Austria the effectual aid of her armies in suppressing them, were unjust and unwarrantable ; but I never heard any objection to his conduct proceed from hon. Members opposite. Again, as to Poland, I remember that as late as during the second Govern-

ment of Lord Palmerston, a Motion was made by Mr. Horsman on the subject of the proceedings of Russia in Poland, but Mr. Horsman was not one of the Party who sat opposite ; on the contrary, he was a gentleman who on all questions of foreign policy expressed the strongest Liberal opinions, and the support which his Motion received proceeded almost wholly from this side of the House. One word with regard to the Papers which have just been laid upon the Table of the House with reference to the misdeeds of the Russians in Poland. That paper purports to be presented by command of Her Majesty, which means that it has been presented at the instance of Her Majesty's Government. (SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: By command of Her Majesty, in pursuance of an Address.) (LORD JOHN MANNERS: It was moved for from the opposite side of the House.) I have no doubt it was moved for from the "opposite" side of the House ; my hon. friends on this side of the House have always been desirous of exhibiting the cruelty in Poland ; but the disposition of the Government and their friends to hold up to reprobation the cruelty in Poland, appears to me to be of much more recent origin. Now, Sir, for my own part, I rejoice in the fact that the misdeeds of a Government should come to light, come how they may ; but I think this mode of proceeding was eminently a shabby mode. You produce the misdeeds of other Governments ; do you produce your own ? Will you lay on the Table a detail of the proceedings by which the Mutiny was suppressed in India ? I cannot recollect a more distinctly culpable proceeding on the part of any country than the slaughter of the Dyaks of Her Majesty's naval Forces, and by Sir James Brooke. But that evil act was discussed, vindicated, and approved in this House. I will give you another case. There is an official Report of my own in the Colonial Office, rendered in 1858-9, when Lord Carnarvon was Under-Secretary, which set forth the proceedings of the British Government in Cephalonia, at a time when a predial rising had taken place. It was a serious predial rising, which official panic or the selfish alarms of a class magnified into a rebellion. As such it was insignificant, almost ludicrous. But martial law was maintained in the island for six weeks. I believe one of our soldiers was wounded. A score of the people were shot, and many scores were flogged, and the punishment of flogging was one viewed by the Greek population, as I have often been assured, with a horror even greater than capital punishment. Will you lay that Report on the Table ? What is the meaning of producing

charges against other countries when you are not prepared to produce your own? (An HON. MEMBER: The Cephalonian Report, I think, has been laid on the Table.) I think not, I must have known of it. And I proceed with my general argument.

One of my greatest objections to the policy of Her Majesty's Government has always been, since we began to attend to it at the end of last July, that it tends so extravagantly to facilitate the execution of the most selfish aims that Russia could possibly entertain, and to enhance her influence and her power. It is a tremendous thing to infuse into the mind of the Christian subjects of the Porte the conviction that they have no other hope, no other ally, but Russia. It is hardly possible to dispute that that has been the effect of the policy of Her Majesty's Government. That the misgovernment of the Slav Provinces should cease is my first and great object, but I confess it would be with qualified satisfaction, although, with a real satisfaction, that I should hear of the cessation of that misgovernment, unless I felt that a healthy growth of local liberty would come into the place of the abominations now afflicting these Provinces. I had hoped that something might be obtained from the Government with reference to the first and second—and even perhaps the third—Resolutions, which would have enabled me to avoid trespassing at so much length on the indulgence of the House. With regard, however, to the fourth Resolution, I was absolutely hopeless. I admit that it challenges the course of the Government, and suggests another course. If you wish, for the sake of humanity, for the sake of the peace of Europe, for the sake of the obligations this country has incurred, to close the Eastern Question, it cannot be satisfactorily done except by action which shall be both united and real. And my complaint against Her Majesty's Government is, that whenever they have seemed to concur in promoting united action it has always been done under conditions which have made that united action useless and even visionary. Do not let me conceal my own belief. I have in my fourth Resolution expressed the strong opinion I entertain—namely, that the policy of 1826 and 1827 was a wise and just policy. But that was a policy that had no more the approval of what I may call the West End of London, than the Christian cause has now. That portion of England does not express the true sentiments of England. Looking over all the great achievements that have made the last half-century illustrious, not one of them would have been effected if the opinions of the West End of London had prevailed. The Test Act

would not have been repealed. Parliament would not have been reformed. Slavery would not have been abolished. Municipal Corporations would not have been opened. The Corn Laws would not have been repealed ; nor Free Trade established ; nor the Tariff reduced to a few lines ; nor the Navigation Laws done away ; nor the Universities opened ; nor the Church of Ireland disestablished ; nor the Land Tenures of that country re-enacted. I might extend this long list. I regard it with sorrow and mis-giving that the nation has ever been in advance of those who ought to have been its leaders. But the fact being so, I cannot relax my efforts in this cause out of deference to the opinion of what I have called the West End of London.

But then I am told that there has been, in relation to this question, inaction on the part of Liberal Governments. Now, Sir, this is a subject much too wide to be disposed of by a taunt, or by any incidental remark. It is question of history ; and if a Motion were made for a complete inquiry into the conduct of all Governments since the Crimean War with regard to this great question, I, for one, would not object to it. In my opinion it is totally impossible for any man, or for any Government in Western Europe to raise the Turkish Question, simply of his or their own motion. How was it possible for us during the Franco-German struggle, or during the protracted controversy that resulted in the Geneva Arbitration, to raise the Turkish Question ? Nay, even if we had been more free, there were no events in Turkey on which we could take our stand. There was, so to speak, no point of departure. There was no revolt of which we could examine the cause ; there were no massacres of which we could expose the guilt. In 1860 massacres did occur in Syria, which may be partially compared with the massacres in Bulgaria in 1876. A Liberal Government was then in office ; and observe the very different course pursued by that Government. Whether we had been wise and right in all things I know not. I am by no means prepared to claim for us off-hand a sentence of universal acquittal, but this I know, that at a very early date, in the affair of the Lebanon, Lord Russell wrote a letter in which he positively announced that a British squadron would be sent to the coast of Syria, and that if necessary marines would be landed. At the same time France declared her intention of sending troops to Syria. We heard nothing then about fears of provoking Turkish valour to desperation by these rather decided methods. On the 28th of July Lord Russell said that the remaining points, which were of

essential importance, appeared to be to obtain the assent of the Porte to the intervention of foreign troops, and the fixing of a time for the intervention of those troops, to cease. On that the consent of Turkey was given, and the foreign intervention did take place. And how was the consent of Turkey given? It was given in a Conference by Safvet Pasha, on the 27th of August, and in terms which were very remarkable. You might have had just the same terms now if you had chosen to seek them in the same manner. They are these—

“It is owing to the counsels of the Representatives of the Powers, and the vision held out to us of foreign troops landing on our territories, notwithstanding the refusal which we should have given to the conclusion of the Convention, that we have been reduced to choose the lesser of two evils.”

The consent of the Turkish Government was obtained; but it was given in view of this—that they had before them the vision of foreign troops landed in Syria, notwithstanding their refusal, and they were reduced to the choice of the lesser of two evils. I ask for a comparison between our course throughout in the matter of the Lebanon, and the course of the existing Government since the Autumn of 1875. I might refer to other matters; but I will not now pursue the subject.

I will next say a few words only on the nature of our obligations in this particular case. It is much too late, in my opinion, to argue whether we are bound to take up the case of the Christians in Turkey or not. We might have argued that question before the Crimean War. But in the Crimean War we did two things; and I must repeat the challenge I have made to the Government with regard to those two things, for they are of vital importance in this great controversy. The first was, that we abolished the power of interference which previously existed, and which was lodged in the hands of Russia. The Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>1</sup> and the Secretary of State for War<sup>2</sup> have told me that they do not admit that such a power of interference existed. I think it is possible that they may have misunderstood my statement; because I am quite certain that if they hold that proposition in the terms I have just stated, they are holding it in the face of history and of law as recognized in Europe for a hundred years. They may have understood me to say that Russia had, by the treaty of Kainardji, a Protectorate over the Christians. Now, I admit that she had no Protectorate over the Christians. A Pro-

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gathorne Hardy.

tectorate is a scheme involving direct and positive powers. She had no such powers in regard to the Christians in Turkey generally. What she had was this—a stipulation from the Porte that the Porte should firmly protect the Christian religion and its churches. Of that stipulation she had a right to require the fulfilment, as well as of every other stipulation in her Treaties. There is not the least doubt that it is a distinct stipulation. To set up the doctrine that this distinct and substantive stipulation is a mere Preamble, that it is absorbed in the latter part of the Article, is really little less than ridiculous. The latter part of the Article is separated from the earlier part by the Italian word which can only be translated by “furthermore,” or “moreover,” or some equivalent. Russia had a covenant with the Porte for the protection of those churches, and she had the same right to require its fulfilment as she had with respect to every other covenant in the Treaty. That, I say, cannot be doubted. Now, let us look at the opinions upon this point. I quoted the other day the opinion of the standard historian of the Turkish Empire—Von Hammer. He expressed the general historical judgment of the world on this point. But, if you want a legal opinion, I will quote that of Bluntschli, who is, I observe, considered as the highest authority as a jurist at present living on the Continent of Europe. He says—

“In the consciousness of this duty and of this right, Europe has repeatedly intervened in Turkey as well as before as after 1856. First of all, Russia made a claim to a sole protection of the Greek Christians, and obtained the establishment of it from Turkey by Treaty in 1772 and 1812.”

There is the opinion of Bluntschli. It is not a controversial opinion; he states it as a notorious fact, in a matter which has never been contested. I am responsible for the translation; but the words “obtained the establishment of it,” I believe, fairly represent the words of the original. Since I spoke before on the matter, I have referred to the authority of Sir Robert Phillimore, and I find in him what I expected. I have had the honour of his friendship for half a century, and I did not open this question without having consulted him. He has entered into an argument to show that Russia did not possess by the Treaty of Kainardji the claim which was made at the time of the Crimean War. In that we are all agreed. But Sir Robert Phillimore has never denied that this stipulation for protection in the Treaty of Kainardji was a binding stipulation; that Russia had a right to require it to be carried into execution, and a right to interfere with Turkey

on a breach of it, just as she had in regard to any other part of the Treaty. As far as I know, opinions are not at variance on this point, unless, indeed, it is intended by the present Government to put up in 1877 a construction never heard of for over 100 years after the Treaty was concluded.

In such a matter, without doubt, we cannot omit to refer to the Blue Books of 1854. I must own it has not been in my power to read through the whole of those Blue Books—or rather to re-read them, for I was pretty well familiar with them at a former period—and, therefore, it is possible some assertion may be found in some part of them which more or less expresses the opinion that appears now to be maintained by the Government. Yet I think not so, because I have looked over them as well as I could, and because I find what seems to be a distinct declaration on the part of Lord Clarendon, that some right of that kind on the part of Russia was acknowledged by us. I recollect myself, taking my memory for what it is worth, that this was distinctly our position in the controversy. We hold that Russia misconstrued the Treaty, and overstated her right ; we never, I believe, denied that she had some right ; and accordingly, I find, also, in Book No. 1, that on May 26th, 1853, Baron Brunnow sends in a Memorandum, in which he speaks of the engagements of the Porte, dating from the Treaty of Kainardji, as granting to the Orthodox Church that freedom of worship, that tranquillity of conscience, and that peaceable possession of rights which Russia could never cease to watch over. In the same book, on the 21st of June, Lord Clarendon says in reply, on the part of the Government, that on the basis of Baron Brunnow's Memorandum, a complete and satisfactory arrangement might have been concluded without compromising the dignity of the Emperor. I think, then, I have made my demonstration complete ; and, if so, the case stands thus—That there was a Treaty engagement, under which Russia was entitled to require from the Porte a protection of the Christians, and to resent it against the Porte as a national wrong if she did not protect them. That right was entirely destroyed and swept away by the Crimean War, through the expenditure of our blood and treasure, and of the blood and treasure of our Allies ; and we could not thus sweep that right away, in my opinion, without becoming responsible for the consequences ; without being as solemnly bound as men can be bound in faith and honour to take care that those, for whose protection it was intended, should obtain either the same thing or something better in its place.

But, besides all I have now said, and even independently of this, as I believe, perfectly irrefragable argument, what was the case of the Crimean War on the very face of it as a dry matter-of-fact ? It was this—That Turkey was about to be engaged in a contest of which the probable result was her defeat. I apprehend there was no doubt of that. It was probable she would be defeated. We intervened to prevent that defeat. We, together with our Allies, gave her a new lease of her existence ; we gave her resources ; we gave her the strength, of which she has been making such frightful use in Bulgaria. And now is it possible for us, on any principles, I care not what, which will bear to be stated in the face of day, so to put out of view the obligations, which our honour entails on us, as to say—"We wash our hands of this business, and will have nothing to do with it" ? Much more, how can we say—"We will consent to pay delicate attentions to the Government of Turkey, and to be affording her in a thousand indirect forms moral assistance"—which in many instances is apt to glide into material assistance—"against any nation which may attempt to carry into effect the judgment of united Europe" ?

I hope I have made pretty clear the state of the case, as it bears upon the third and fourth Resolutions. I have pursued not the best tactics, perhaps—for I am, perhaps, no great tactician—but the best tactics in my power. Very simple they have been. They have consisted in attempting to obtain the assertion, by as many as possible, of what was valuable in itself, even although it was not the whole of what seemed to me valuable or even essential. On that account I ranged my Resolutions in the order in which they stand ; and when I found myself threatened with extinction by the somewhat rude machinery of the Previous Question, so that a free and unfettered discussion, even of the first Resolution, was to be rendered impossible, I came readily to the conclusion that it would not be expedient or becoming for me to ask you, Sir, to go through the idle form of putting each of them in succession from the Chair, with the certainty of obtaining a decision that they should not be put. But I am bound to say that to the whole of these Resolutions I, as an individual, steadfastly adhere. I ask no sanction from my noble friend near me (the Marquis of Hartington) for anything except that for which he votes. I think it would be the meanest and paltriest act on my part to endeavour to crib from him some indirect support for that which he is not prepared to support overtly. I really know not on what grounds he is not willing to accompany me in the whole of these

Resolutions. I would thankfully accept his aid, as I would the aid of the Government, for I think the union of the English people in this great matter is an object of the highest importance. There is not one of you opposite who can more deeply deplore than I do the use of the rude irregular methods to which we have been driven in order to exercise an influence upon the foreign policy of the country. I look upon these methods as, at the best, unsatisfactory and imperfect ; I look upon them, in every case, except the case of necessity, as vicious and bad. It has been that necessity alone which has driven us to the point at which we stand to-night. For my part, I think no day of peace likely to come for the East, no final or satisfactory settlement, unless it be by the authority of united Europe. I see the hon. and learned gentleman the Attorney General<sup>1</sup> has been complaining of violent language, and of the imputation of motives on my part. He is, I suppose, on the way to high judicial office, and from one in his position, as compared with other Members of this House, I have a right to expect something more than the average share of judicial temper. But what said he to his constituents ? I have never imputed motives to the Government. I have never said they were governed by love of power. I should have been ashamed of such a statement. I cannot, indeed, account for their conduct, except by the supposition of some singular delusion, of some sinister influence which they do not themselves understand, and are not conscious of, so strange does it appear to me. But never have I imputed to them motives inconsistent with their perfect honour. Yet what says the hon. and learned gentleman. He goes to his constituents, and to them he announces that I have entered into a warfare against the Government, animated by a vindictive malignity founded on my exclusion from office. (" Oh, oh ! ") These are the judicial words of the hon. and learned gentleman. I am glad he has come into his place. It gives me the opportunity of expressing a hope that when he resigns that place for one more permanent, more dignified, and more enjoyable, he will proceed in a different spirit to deal with the suitors, and even with the culprits, who may be brought before him. No, Sir, I impute no motives. If a word I have said seems to convey them, I disclaim it, and in a moment I would wash it away ; but I believe no such word has passed my lips. It is a great crisis, Sir, in which we stand. Legislative Bodies are at all times occupied, more or less, in the making of history, and it is a very grave

<sup>1</sup> Sir John Holker.

passage of history which we are now engaged in making. Sir, there is before us not one controversy, but two. There is the controversy between Russia and Turkey ; there is the controversy between Turkey and her revolted subjects. I think the Government and their supporters out-of-doors in the Press are committing a great error in this—that it is the first of these two controversies—that between Russia and Turkey, which, after all, is only symptomatic—to which they address their minds. In my opinion, the other is the deeper and more important. The other is a controversy which can have no issue but one, and I do not hesitate to say that the cause of the revolted subjects of Turkey against their oppressors is as holy a cause as ever animated the breast, or as ever stirred the hand of man. Sir, what part are we to play in regard to it ? Looking at this latter controversy—the controversy between Turkey and her subjects—the horrible massacres of last year, the proofs of which have been afforded that they are only parts and indications of a system ; that their recurrence is to be expected, nay, that it is a matter of moral certainty, if they are now allowed to pass with impunity ; looking at the total want of result from Lord Derby's efforts, at that mockery which has been cast in our teeth in return for what I quite admit was upon ordinary rules and principles an insulting despatch, can we, Sir, say, with regard to this great battle of freedom against oppression which is now going on, which has been renewed from time to time, and for which one-third of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina are at this moment not only suffering exile ; but, terrible to say, are upon the very verge of absolute starvation ; upon which depends the fate of millions of the subject-races that inhabit the Turkish Empire—can we, with all this before us, be content with what I will call a vigorous array of remonstrances ?—well intended, I grant, but without result, as expressing the policy and satisfying the obligations of this great country. Can we, I say, looking upon this battle, lay our hands upon our hearts and, in the face of God and man, say with respect to it—“ We have well and sufficiently performed our part ” ? Sir, there were other days, when England was the hope of freedom. Wherever in the world a high aspiration was entertained, or a noble blow was struck, it was to England that the eyes of the oppressed were always turned—to this favourite, this darling home of so much privilege and so much happiness, where the people that had built up a noble edifice for themselves would, it was well known, be ready to do what in them lay to secure the benefit

of the same inestimable boon for others. You talk to me of the established tradition and policy in regard to Turkey. I appeal to an established tradition, older, wiser, nobler far—a tradition not which disregards British interests, but which teaches you to seek the promotion of those interests in obeying the dictates of honour and of justice. And, Sir, what is to be the end of this? Are we to dress up the fantastic ideas some people entertain about this policy, and that policy in the garb of British interests, and then, with a new and base idolatry, to fall down and worship them? Or are we to look, not at the sentiment, but at the hard facts of the case, which Lord Derby told us fifteen years ago—namely, that it is the populations of those countries that will ultimately possess them—that will ultimately determine their abiding condition? It is to this fact, this law, that we should look. There is now before the world a glorious prize. A portion of those as yet unhappy people are still making an effort to retrieve what they have lost so long, but have not ceased to love and to desire. I speak of those in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another portion—a band of heroes such as the world has rarely seen—stand on the rocks of Montenegro, and are ready now, as they have ever been during the 400 years of their exile from their fertile plains, to sweep down from their fastnesses and meet the Turks at any odds for the re-establishment of justice and of peace in those countries. Another portion still, the 5,000,000 of Bulgarians, cowed and beaten down to the ground, hardly venturing to look upwards, even to their Father in heaven, have extended their hands to you; they have sent you their petition, they have prayed for your help and protection. They have told you that they do not seek alliance with Russia, or with any foreign Power, but that they seek to be diverted from an intolerable burden of woe and shame. That burden of woe and shame—the greatest that exists on God's earth—is one that we thought united Europe was about to remove; that in the Protocol united Europe was pledged to remove; but to removing which, for the present, you seem to have no efficacious means of offering even the smallest practical contribution. But, Sir, the removal of that load of woe and shame is a great and noble prize. It is a prize well worth competing for. It is not yet too late to try to win it. I believe there are men in the Cabinet who would try to win it, if they were free to act on their own beliefs and aspirations. It is not yet too late, I say, to become competitors for that prize; but be assured that whether you mean to claim for yourselves even a single leaf in that immortal chaplet of

renown, which will be the reward of true labour in that cause, or whether you turn your backs upon that cause and your own duty, I believe, for one, that the knell of Turkish tyranny in those Provinces has sounded. So far as human eye can judge, it is about to be destroyed. The destruction may not come in the way, or by the means that we should choose ; but come this boon from what hands it may, it will be a noble boon, and as a noble boon will gladly be accepted by Christendom and the world.

# THE TREATY OF BERLIN

JULY 30, 1878

The Treaty of Berlin, which succeeded the war between Russia and Turkey for the control of the Balkan Peninsula, was variously received in this country. It was severely criticized both by the partisans of Turkey and by the partisans of Russia. It gave effect to a large part of the policy of which Gladstone had made himself the champion by liberating Bulgaria, and other portions of South-Eastern Europe, from Turkish control. At the same time it did nothing for Greece, or, on the other hand, for Montenegro, which had fought most valiantly on behalf of the Christian populations oppressed by Turkey. In this speech, which was almost equally admired by friends and foes, Gladstone subjects the whole Treaty to a keen and searching analysis. He points out that the Greeks, who relied upon the assurances of Europe, and abstained from drawing the sword, were far less generously treated than the Servians and Bulgarians, who had defied Europe, and attacked Turkey themselves. Turkey had been dismembered. But those who deserved the most to profit by the dismemberment had been put off with vague promises, while Russia had been able to retain all the valuable and substantial benefits which she secured for herself by the Treaty of San Stefano. No serious answer was ever made to the speech, which is remarkable for its studious self-restraint, and the preponderance of reason over rhetoric.

**M**R. SPEAKER, I desire in the first place to discharge one of the most agreeable portions of my duty. I cordially congratulate the noble Lord<sup>1</sup> on his first appearance as a Member of the Cabinet, in one of the great debates of this House. He had long, in my poor judgment, before he became an Adviser of the Crown, given evidence of his capacity to take a responsible part in the conduct of public affairs ; and it is with very sincere pleasure, both on account of those from whom he descends in the last two generations and on his own account, that I see him occupying his present position, and that I have heard the doubtless very able, certainly very eloquent, but I am afraid I am obliged to add, in my opinion, somewhat imaginative speech, which he has just delivered. Whether it was that the noble Lord found the subject before us so intricate, or so narrow and limited, I know not ; but it happened that he quitted the field of that subject, and that one-half, at the very least, of his speech was occupied by a

<sup>1</sup> Viscount Sandon.

discussion of the conduct and policy of Liberal Governments in former years, with relation to the Eastern Question. I think I am within the mark when I speak of that proportion of the noble Lord's speech. I am unable, Sir, to follow the noble Lord with fulness into that part of his discourse. What I have to say is unhappily a great deal too much, perhaps, for the patience of this House; certainly too much to allow me, with any sense of moderation, to deal with matters which appear to me to be very indirectly and partially connected with the great, complex, and difficult subjects of this debate.

I will only take notice that the noble Lord has, with great fairness, admitted on behalf of the Liberal Governments, down to 1866, that, in his opinion, they pursued a very good and useful course with respect to the Sultan of Turkey and the condition of the Turkish Empire. But the noble Lord has drawn a contrast to the disparagement of the late Government which I regret, and regret the more because I am not prepared to argue with him in detail at this time. He says that answers were given, in the time of the late Government, by the then Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs,<sup>1</sup> to Questions put in this House, with which I, as Prime Minister, and as therefore specially conversant with the business of the Foreign Department, must have been acquainted before they were given. Now, before the noble Lord made that statement, did he refer to his hon. friend the present Under-Secretary of State,<sup>2</sup> to know whether the Under-Secretary refers to the Prime Minister of the present Government all the answers which he gives in this House to Questions put to him, even upon matters in themselves of great importance, in the Department of Foreign Affairs? The noble Lord is entirely wrong in supposing that such answers, if unconnected with the actual transactions of the day, commonly come before the Prime Minister. With those replies I had no concern. I do not, however, hesitate to admit, in the main, the allegation of the noble Lord. When the late Government was formed, Lord Clarendon, who was Foreign Minister, considered carefully in what way he could make himself most useful with reference to the East, and he determined, with my entire concurrence, that by far the best mode of applying his efforts at the time would be to endeavour to arrive at a *modus vivendi*—a good understanding with the great Empire of Russia, as regarded our relative positions in the regions of Central Asia. The interest attaching to that question was the same as that

<sup>1</sup> Viscount Enfield.

<sup>2</sup> Hon. Robert Bourke.

which appears now to supply a governing motive for many hon. Members forming the majority of this House—namely, the safety of our Indian Empire. That design was actively and successfully prosecuted by Lord Clarendon during his too contracted term of Office. Unhappily for his country, he died in the summer of 1870, and immediately after his decease, there broke out the Franco-German War, with a train of serious questions attaching to it, and with the effect of engrossing the care and attention of Europe. These matters had hardly reached a settlement when we found it our duty to confront that singularly delicate and difficult controversy with the United States, which ended in the Arbitration of Geneva, and not very long before our expulsion from Office. And the noble Lord, who cannot but know of that state of foreign affairs, in the years to which I have referred, of the profound disturbance of Europe in 1870 and 1871, of our own anxious occupations in 1872 and 1873, in relation to the American Settlement, and who must also know what was our condition in this House, and the arduous course of legislation in which we were incessantly engaged, notwithstanding, does not scruple to bring against us the great, and, as he thinks, damning accusation that, with mind and times so charged with all these subjects, we did not likewise make a spontaneous and thorough investigation into the condition of the Turkish Empire, both in Europe and in Asia, and that at a period when nothing had occurred which would suffice to give to the question a place in the thought and care of the Powers of Europe. The noble Lord, I must say, does not appear to me to have made himself master of the elementary facts which bear upon every such case. It is not in the power of any European Government to raise the Turkish Question effectually at its own will and pleasure. It cannot be raised, unless circumstances occurring elsewhere, and generally within Turkey itself, give it that position in the view of Europe which compels attention, and which obviously requires, in the general interest, that it should become matter of practical consideration. Such was not the case when we were in Office, but such has been the case ever since the beginning of the rebellion in Herzegovina.

I am now, Sir, obliged with much regret to advert to a personal question. Twenty-four hours ago I had not the smallest intention of touching upon a matter which is to me extremely repulsive. I mean the question of personal charges introduced into political controversy. Some words which fell last night from the hon. and learned gentleman the Member for the Uni-

versity of Dublin,<sup>1</sup> in moving his Amendment, rendered it necessary for me to notice the subject, although I do not in the least degree complain of those words. But in addition to his remarks, I became aware this morning of language which was used last night, and which enhanced my obligation to take notice of this matter. A declaration was made by Lord Beaconsfield, which led me to think it my duty to address to the noble Earl a short letter, and that letter, with the permission of the House, I will now read—

“ July 30, 1878.

“ Dear Lord Beaconsfield,—I find you are reported in *The Times* of to-day to have made last night a reference to a speech delivered by me at Oxford, and in which you stated that I described you as a dangerous and even a devilish character. I shall be obliged by your informing me on what words of mine you found this statement. You are likewise reported to have said that during the controversy on the Eastern Question I have indulged in criticisms replete with the most offensive epithets upon your conduct and in description of your character. Will you have the goodness to supply me with a list or selection of those offensive epithets, applied not merely to your measures, but to your personal character, and with a note of the times and places at which they were used? If you have been inaccurately reported, I ask your pardon for having troubled you with this letter, which is, I need hardly add, of a public nature.”

I thus addressed the noble Earl, because if it can be shown that I have made use of such epithets and indulged in such attacks, it would be my plain duty to make apology for them. I have not yet received an answer, and I could hardly have expected it; for the letter has not been for very many hours in the hands of the noble Earl to whom it was addressed.

The allusion of the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University<sup>1</sup> was to a passage in a speech delivered by Lord Beaconsfield on Saturday last. I had had no intention before this allusion of referring to the subject at all, and I would only now say of it that, when I read it, I reflected with some pleasure and some comfort upon the fact that it gave a much more innocent account of me than had been given in a speech delivered by the same noble Earl at Aylesbury about two years ago. The hon. and learned gentleman said he regarded the speech of Lord Beaconsfield on Saturday, in this portion of it, as jocose. It was hardly so regarded by the author, who was delivering at the very same time an entirely opposite account of it. But the hon. and learned gentleman said it was the result of provocation, which provocation

<sup>1</sup> Hon. David Plunket.

had been given partly by me. I had referred to the Government, it seems, as speaking in the accents of "lispering babes." I do not suppose it is necessary for me to dwell upon that phrase. But I had also spoken of the policy of the Government as dishonouring to the country. I had so spoken, without doubt; and it was my duty so to speak; and it will be my duty so to speak again. But I deny that the fact that I had declared the policy of the Government to be a dishonouring policy for the country constitutes a personal provocation, or can be rightly regarded as a personal attack. I claim in the fullest and largest sense for all Members of this House the right and duty to describe, if they conscientiously and advisedly believe it, the acts and the policy of the Government of the day as dishonourable in themselves, and as calculated to bring dishonour on the country. I am the first to admit that they exercise this duty under a great responsibility. They ought not to make such charges lightly. They ought not to make such charges without a full examination of the facts. They ought not to make them, except in a spirit of readiness to confess themselves mistaken, upon adequate proof that they are wrong. But, subject to this limitation, I believe that the doctrine of the hon. and learned gentleman is totally untenable. If you forbid Members of this House to denounce, when they see cause, the policy of the Government as a dishonouring policy, I would almost go as far as to say that you may soon proceed to shut the doors of the House. By such a doctrine you will be denying to Members of Parliament what I will not now call a privilege, but what is one of their most sacred obligations. You will likewise take from the country one of the best guarantees it can possibly have against abuse and malversation in the conduct of public affairs. I beg the honourable and learned gentleman, of whom I make no complaint whatever, to understand that however painful it may be—and it is most painful—to resort to these hard and condemnatory terms, they are, nevertheless, when the occasion arises, an absolute necessity of free Parliamentary discussion. The liberty of speech which we enjoy, and the publicity which attends our political life and action, are, I believe, the matters in which we have the greatest amount of advantage over some other countries of the civilized world. That liberty of speech is the liberty which secures all other liberties, and the abridgment of which would render all other liberties vain and useless possessions.

I now pass on to some very grave matters, of which the noble

Lord<sup>1</sup> seems to think he has satisfactorily disposed. I, however, having listened to the admirable speech in which the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition<sup>2</sup> moved his Resolution, and to the able speeches delivered last night in its support—I refer particularly to two which I was so fortunate as to hear from the hon. Members for Chelsea<sup>3</sup> and for Glamorganshire<sup>4</sup>—cannot think he has disposed of or answered them in any adequate degree. The noble Lord seemed to me—taking a wide range over an unbounded field—to overlook the fact that we are now gathered together primarily for the purpose of examining in detail the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, in the course of most important negotiations which necessarily—I refer to the Treaty of Berlin—have not been until within the last few days within our knowledge. I have a serious charge to make against the Government with respect to their attitude and conduct at Berlin. Having such a charge to advance, justice requires of me that the Government shall have no reason to complain of want of minuteness and precision in the references I shall make to the different portions of the subject, and in the evidence I shall produce to support my statements.

Now, Sir, in regard to the Treaty of Berlin, I must, in common with every other reasonable person, contemplate it, in the first instance, as a Treaty which brings us an assurance of peace. In that view it must be to us all a matter of infinite thankfulness. That is a statement which I freely offer to the noble Lord ; but I fear that I must part company from him when we come to consider the questions how and by whom it is that peace has been brought about, and what amount of gratitude we owe in this respect to Her Majesty's Government. I state nothing new to hon. gentlemen opposite, when I repeat my previously expressed opinion—that for many months past we have been unable to discern any danger to the existence of the peace which was re-established at San Stefano, excepting in the opinions, and the warlike preparations, of Her Majesty's Government. From no other quarter has there proceeded any act or indication which appeared seriously to threaten the peace of Europe.

When I come to examine the work done by the Congress at Berlin, I find it capable of being sketched in general outline as follows :—Roumania, instead of remaining a tributary State as heretofore, has become independent, and has received some

<sup>1</sup> Viscount Sandon.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Charles Dilke.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Hartington.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Hussey Vivian.

accession of territory, on which I shall have further to remark. Servia, which was also tributary, has acquired its independence, and likewise an enlargement of its bounds. Montenegro, which was independent, but whose independence had not, or had not recently, been acknowledged by Turkey, has obtained from Turkey a recognition of that independence. It has also received a slight enlargement of territory, crippled, I am sorry to say, both in amount and by means of invidious and unworthy regulations, without a word of objection from us, and in consequence of the selfish jealousy of Austria. Moreover, the Treaty intends, and partially provides, that the frontier of Greece is to be somewhat enlarged. In all these points we are dealing with an absolute alienation from Turkish rule, and, upon the whole, the effect of this portion of the Treaty is that, in round numbers, 7,000,000 of persons who were formerly either under the direct Sovereignty or Suzerainty of the Porte, are to be henceforward as free from it as we are. It appears to have been said, upon high authority, that it is a great mistake to suppose that Turkey has suffered partition. However, the first great fact at which I have arrived is that 7,000,000 of people formerly under her rule, either absolute or modified, are now entirely and, as I trust, for ever, exempted from the yoke.

I come now to another class of cases, and I look first to Northern Bulgaria. I find that it is to be a virtually independent Province, though it will nominally remain in a condition of vassalage. That vassalage, as I understand, will be marked by no other feature than that of an obligation to pay tribute to the Porte. Such a state of things is very nearly equivalent to a total emancipation.

I next come to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and here I must make an observation in answer to the noble Lord. The noble Lord says I have claimed to have been from the beginning in favour of the subject-populations of Turkey. I had made that claim, but in saying it was so from the beginning, I did not mean from the beginning of time, or from the beginning of the century; but I meant at the moment no more than this—It was from the beginning of the present Eastern Controversy in 1875–1876. My meaning, Sir, was that, for one, I utterly repelled the doctrine that the power of Turkey is to be dragged to the ground for the purpose of handing over the Dominion that Turkey now exercises to some other great State, be that State either Russia or Austria, or even England. In my opinion such a view is utterly false, and even

ruinous, and has been the source of the main difficulties in which the Government have been involved, and in which they have involved the country. I hold that those Provinces of the Turkish Empire, which have been so cruelly and unjustly ruled, ought to be regarded as existing, not for the sake of any other Power whatever, but for the sake of the populations by whom they are inhabited. The object of our desire ought to be the development of those populations on their own soil, as its proper masters, and as the persons with a view to whose welfare its destination ought to be determined. Applying this test, Sir, to the next case which comes before me—namely the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, I can speak of the arrangement made at Berlin with only a partial satisfaction. Those Provinces have been handed over to Austria under terms of studied ambiguity. The populations have not been placed in a position to assume for the future paramount control of their own destinies. But although they have not attained to an absolute freedom from external control, they have been as completely severed as Servia and Roumania from the dominion of the Porte ; and I am free to admit that there are circumstances connected with their internal condition which may render it expedient that, at any rate for a time, the military strength of a great Power, and its regular organization, should be made available to secure for them the blessings of an orderly, and in many respects, of a free government.

If that be so, Sir, then in addition to 7,000,000 of people who have been absolutely cut off from the Ottoman Empire, there must be, as I reckon, 4,500,000 more, in round numbers, who, although not formally separated from Turkey, yet practically have bid to her a final farewell. Before the late war, there were not less than 17,000,000 of people who were subjects of the Ottoman Empire, in absolute or qualified subordination, and out of those 17,000,000 it appears that not less than 11,500,000 have undergone a total change in those relations—most of them by the possession of formal independence, the others by the attainment of what is, in effect, practical liberation.

Now, Sir, if even this were all, it seems a little difficult to lay down the doctrine that there has been no partition of Turkish territory. We have, indeed, been told that the rule of the Sultan in Europe has been concentrated exactly in the same sense as a man's body is concentrated when his limbs have been amputated. It is reduced, curtailed ; it is hemmed in on every side by absolute or qualified freedom. If that be concentration, it is concen-

trated ; but not otherwise. There was a partition of Poland in the last century—almost exactly 100 years ago. Now, what do we mean when we speak of the first partition of Poland ? Poland had a population of about 12,000,000 before that partition. By that partition it was reduced to between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000. In the case of Turkey, a population of from 17,000,000 to 18,000,000 has been reduced, as we learn upon official authority, to 6,000,000 ; and yet we are gravely told, upon the same high official authority, that it is quite a mistake to suppose that there has been any partition of the Ottoman Empire.

I have not, Sir, however, gone through the whole work of the Congress. We have had most important engagements undertaken by the whole of assembled Europe with respect to Armenia. The noble Lord appears to be under the impression that although Russia has acquired a new frontier for herself in Armenia, that is all which has occurred, and that with the exception of that single change, the entire field of Asiatic Turkey has been left open to us by the Treaty of Berlin. The noble Lord must have overlooked that Article of the Treaty which refers to the future condition of Armenia. It is not a field left open to us. The whole of the Powers of Europe have required from the Porte the reformation—which means the transformation—of the government of Armenia. They have obtained from the Porte a Treaty stipulation to that effect. That Treaty stipulation has been concluded by Turkey, not only with all the Powers, but with each Power. In the Treaty of Paris, in 1856, the Powers made provision against the single action within the Turkish Empire of any among them. There is no such settlement in the Treaty of Berlin. The covenants of Turkey are covenants with all, and are likewise covenants with each, and each Power with which the engagements have been contracted would be entitled to call Turkey to account for the breach of those engagements. There is, therefore, a most important provision made for the future intervention of Europe in the internal affairs of that portion of Asiatic Turkey which borders upon the Russian frontier. I must, however, Sir, revert to Turkey in Europe with which I have not yet completely finished.

Eastern Roumelia is to be constituted as a separate Province, with local autonomy. In Lord Salisbury's Agreement with Count Schouvaloff, this territory was described as Southern Bulgaria. It appears to have been thought by the British Government that an essential change would be effected in its future condition by altering its name to Eastern Roumelia. However profound

that conception may be, I very greatly regret that it has not been in the power of the Congress at Berlin to give more full development to some of the essential portions of its plan, and among them to the meaning of local autonomy in Eastern Roumelia. So much has been left, both here and elsewhere, to be worked out by subordinate agencies, that a great amount of uncertainty still attaches to many and very important portions of the work of the Congress, and a doubt is even cast upon the final issue which its labours may take, and upon the probable duration of its arrangements. What, for instance, is to be the meaning of local autonomy in Eastern Roumelia? There is in these words an elasticity such as may admit of a return of all the old abuses; or, on the other hand, of the establishment of a system under which life and property and the honour of woman will be secured, and the management of the local affairs will be virtually committed to the hands of the population. All this, we find, is to depend upon an International Commission. We do not know precisely in what way that Commission is to be appointed—how it is to be composed, under whose influence it will act, what spirit will animate its proceedings; and I deeply lament the uncertainty which hangs over this and other portions of the arrangements vital to the happiness of the subject-populations; but yet I hardly recognize the principle on which it proceeds, especially in this aspect—that neither the Regular nor the Irregular Turkish Forces are to act for any purpose within Eastern Roumelia. The Irregulars are absolutely forbidden; the Regulars will simply have a right of military passage for the defence of the Northern frontier. This is a most important gain in the cause of civilization; and although we are told that Roumelia has been restored to the direct political and military rule of the Sultan, yet, if its government is to be settled in conformity with the spirit of the promises that have been made, much will have to be done, if not for absolute political freedom, yet for the extinction of the horrible mischiefs and the debasing influences to which it has hitherto been subjected under the rule of the Porte.

I come now, Sir, to the case of Crete and of the Hellenic Provinces. With respect to Crete, I find that what is called its organic law is to be taken as the starting point. I do not much care what is the starting point, as compared with the direction in which we are starting, and the distance to which we are travelling. The organic law of Crete is not a good law. In that Island there are, at the very least, as I believe, four Christians to one

Mahommedan, and a fundamental provision of the organic law is this—that in the representation of the population the Mahommedans, who are one-fifth, and the Christians, who are four-fifths, are to have respectively an equal number of representatives. The Governor of Crete has been a Mahommedan appointed by the Porte, I believe, without any effective limitation, and the organic law of Crete has, I fear, been little better than a dead letter. However, it involves an admission of principle that may work itself into something worth having. We must not criticize too much the minute details of a great arrangement. Taking the whole of the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin together, I most thankfully and joyfully acknowledge that great results have been achieved in the diminution of human misery, and towards the establishment of human happiness and prosperity in the East.

It is impossible, Sir, not to be struck by the contrast which these great negotiations must present in their bearing upon two great races—the Hellenes and the Slavs respectively. There are unhappily, as I think, many Slavs remaining in Eastern Roumelia and the work of the Congress is fundamentally defective so far as they are concerned ; yet, upon the whole, and subject to deductions in detail, a great work of emancipation has been accomplished for the Slavs of the Turkish Empire. The Slavs relied upon Russia, and this is the reward which they have received. But there is a population which has, for us, perhaps an even greater, certainly a more fascinating, interest. This population did not rely upon Russia ; they, indeed, very studiously severed themselves from Russian interests. During the war a portion of the Hellenes of the Turkish Empire—I do not speak of those of the Kingdom—a portion of the Hellenes of the Turkish Empire put up prayers in their churches against Russia. They sent to the Ottoman Government voluntary contributions to aid in carrying on the war against Russia ; they declared themselves in very strong language to be hostile to Russia and to her designs ; and what is the treatment that they have received at the hands of the Congress ? Does it not cause to you, the majority of this House, some pain and some misgiving when you examine the different results of the different courses which have been taken by these two different nationalities ? The Slavs who relied upon Russia have, in the main, obtained what they desired ; the Hellenes, who relied upon England, have, in the main, failed to obtain it. So much for the work of the Congress at large. One word as to the bearing of that work upon Russian

designs. I do not see that Russia, in what concerns herself, had much to complain of. If her purposes have been at all crippled, it has been, not in what she sought for herself, but in what she sought on behalf of others. She has obtained the sanction of Europe to her territorial conquests; she has established, free from all European interference, her title by Treaty with Turkey to a large war indemnity. As respects that indemnity, she is subject to no other pledge whatever than that she will not interfere with revenues already under hypothecation—a limitation which I conceive to be of a very narrow scope. When we look to the reduction of the Bulgaria of Berlin as compared with the Bulgaria of the Treaty of San Stefano, I do not find in the change which has been effected any interference with those projects of intrigue which you conceive to be the incessant purpose of Russia. On the contrary, if it be true that Russia is perpetually engaged in the prosecution of such intrigues among the subject-races of Turkey, you could not possibly have provided her with a finer field for them than you have provided in your arrangements for the political severance between the Bulgarians on the Northern side of the Balkans and the Bulgarians on the Southern side, in the valley of the Maritza. Within a few miles there will be two portions of one and the same race, with the same language, traditions, religion, and ecclesiastical organization, but differing materially in the possession of political privileges; the one virtually independent, the other, as we have been told, under the direct political and military rule of the Sultan. Such a distinction in the condition of men who are nationally brothers in the strictest sense, offers to Russia an admirable opportunity for intrigue. A small Bulgaria would enable Russia to retain a far greater influence within its limits than a large Bulgaria; and a Southern Bulgaria, though called Roumelia, will supply her with further opportunities.

I now come, Sir, to touch upon the most serious character—namely, the attitude and action of the British Plenipotentiaries in that great Assembly at Berlin—for a great Assembly it was—with respect to the series of points brought successively under their notice. And here justice requires me to state that if, at a former period, in speaking of the two noble Lords by whom we have been represented, I have drawn a distinction between Lord Beaconsfield and any other Member or Members of the Administration, I am not about to revert to any such distinction on the present occasion. It appears to me that the two British Pleni-

potentiaries who did the main part of the work at Congress were acting together in perfect harmony. I do not now speak of Lord Odo Russell, who discharged, as he was sure to discharge, his duties with great ability; but whose labours were chiefly in a province different from that of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury. Now, Sir, what, as an Englishman, I am disposed to expect and to ask from the English Plenipotentiaries in a European Congress is this. They represent a country which holds itself up to be the freest of all nationalities in Europe, by its traditions, by its institutions, by its principles, by its feelings. We are, therefore, entitled to expect that when the great States of Europe meet together in Congress, our Plenipotentiaries shall be Representatives of the views and principles which prevail in England; that they shall lean towards the side of freedom and away from the side of servitude. Has that been the case with our Plenipotentiaries in the late Congress at Berlin? I state with a deep regret, with a readiness and desire to be confuted if I am wrong, but, for the present, with a too firm conviction, that the course adopted by our Plenipotentiaries at the Berlin Congress has been precisely the reverse of that which I have pointed out. I have reluctantly arrived at this conclusion after a careful study of the whole of these Protocols. Now, I admit most fully that I ought not to make such a statement as that just made without showing precisely what I mean by it.

Before I proceed to do this, let me first specify that which is to be set down on the other side of the account. In two points, I admit that the British Plenipotentiaries took the right side. The first of them was the great activity shown by Lord Salisbury on the subject of the admission to the Congress of the Representatives of several of the minor States. Upon this matter, a zeal almost exuberant, at any rate ample, was evinced by the Representatives of England; and there can be no doubt that it excited sanguine expectations in the minds of those who represented the minor States as to the results which would follow their admission, and at the very least as to the course which England would adopt in defence of their interests. But, Sir, I am compelled to ask this question—Did any one of these minor States take one sixpence-worth of benefit from the admission of its Representative to the Congress? I have examined, as well as I could, the circumstances and particulars of those admissions. The Envoys were most courteously allowed to enter the doors. They, no doubt, made their bows with due ceremony. They submitted the

statements they had to deliver, and they were bowed out again ; and this, no question, with the same courtesy as that which had attended their entry ; but it does not appear that in any one single instance any one argument or statement made by them had the most remote, or even infinitesimal, effect upon the decisions adopted by the Congress. I would almost go as far as to say that their admission to the Congress was not worth the railway fares and the hotel bills which their respective countries would have to pay on account of the mission of these gentlemen. Another point on which the English Plenipotentiaries showed a great zeal was that which related to the establishment of perfect religious liberty within the emancipated States. Absolute and perfect equality, civil as well as ecclesiastical, political as well as civil, was required to prevail in every one of these new States. In the case of Lord Beaconsfield, it is appropriate to remark that he, who had, with a courageous consistency, insisted on the emancipation of the Jews at home, was taking a part very appropriate in insisting on this provision in the arrangements abroad. I cannot quite say the same with regard to his brother Plenipotentiary, who had been a stout opponent, to the best of his ability, of political enfranchisement among us. It is likewise a little amusing to observe with what edifying zeal all the great States of Europe united to force religious liberty upon those new-fledged bantlings of politics, on their first view of the light of day ; and yet these great States have hardly in any case learned—perhaps we ourselves have not perfectly learned—to adopt it at home. It certainly does not exist in France, where the most distinguished preacher of his generation—the Pere Hyacinthe—delivers religious discourses in Paris, not in the enjoyment of a right given him by law, but under a permission renewable from time to time by the Government. It certainly does not exist in Austria, where the Old Catholics have had to send their children to schools of which they did not approve. But I perceive tokens on the part of one or two hon. gentlemen, which remind me that I am entering into details that can very well be dispensed with. I thank them for the intimation, and will at once proceed to matters more important to the present issue. I must, however, point out that, in this instance, where the British Plenipotentiaries were right, there was virtually no contest in the Congress. Except upon a single point in reference to a single State, all were of one mind.

I have already said that, as a general rule, the British Plenipotentiaries took the side opposed to that of freedom. Now let

us see what part they actually played. When the Congress came to deal with Bulgaria, which was to have full practical emancipation from the Turkish rule, what do we find? We find, simply, that they directed their attention to limiting in the utmost possible degree the local area of the new State, even to the extent of taking from it districts inhabited by a pure Slav population. So far as regards the striking off from the Bulgaria of San Stefano districts inhabited by Hellenes, they were perfectly right; but so far as they severed the Southern Slavs from the larger privileges of their Northern neighbours, they worked against liberty as well as against policy.

Next, when I look to Roumelia, I find that the British Plenipotentiaries laboured to extend its limits as against Bulgaria; but, at the same time, to limit its internal liberties as against the Porte. The views of those Plenipotentiaries are fully set out in the Protocols. I can prove what I have said by an abundance of references, but I am content to take only the proof to be found at pages 76 and 79 of these Papers. It will there be seen, with regard to Roumelia, what the English Plenipotentiaries proposed to provide within that State. They proposed to provide that the Governor-General should have the right to call in Ottoman troops without any limitation, when he deemed it necessary; but they left it to the French Plenipotentiaries to suggest that, in the exercise of his power of sending troops into that State at the call of the Governor-General, the Sultan should be bound to make known the measure to the States of Europe, together with the reasons for it. This is the form of the Article as it stands. Now, I say that in this instance the British Plenipotentiaries clearly leant towards the side of servitude in proposing that the Ottoman troops should be called in, and they left it to the French Plenipotentiaries to introduce the important qualification leaning towards the side of freedom, by requiring that the Porte when it sent in these troops, should be responsible to Europe. ("No!") Hon. gentlemen opposite will run a risk of obliging me to do that which I have no desire to do—namely, to multiply the citations by which it is but too easy to prove that the Plenipotentiaries have acted in the manner that I have described.

Even in the case of Montenegro, the proposal was that the Treaty of Berlin should state that the independence of that country was definitely recognized. The word "definitely" was not an unimportant word, because, at a former period of the history of that heroic State, her independence had, if I am not

mistaken, for once, at least, been already recognized by Turkey, and the recognition had been withdrawn or neutralized by after events. The word, therefore, had a substantive meaning on behalf of freedom ; but who was it that proposed to strike out that word ? It was the British Plenipotentiary. I will not now detain the House by instituting a detailed comparison between the limits of Montenegro as settled by the Treaty of Berlin, and as settled by the Treaty of San Stefano. I do not pronounce upon the changes with universal censure ; but, on the whole, the alteration is not to the credit of Europe. It has evidently been dictated by the will of Austria, and wrung from the necessities of Russia.

Now, with respect to Austria—the favourite Power of Her Majesty's Government. We know perfectly well that her history has been one long series of efforts to resist and repress freedom wherever it arose. She opposed the emancipation of Greece ; she opposed the union of Italy, and put down, by violence, all the efforts made by the people of that country. She opposed the union of Germany. And, although Constitutional government has been established within her own dominions, it was established, not by free will, but by compulsion ; and even now, when it has been so established, it does not in the least degree appear that the spirit of her Parliamentary Government has become favourable to the extension of freedom among neighbouring peoples. Nay, for once in his life, even the Turkish Plenipotentiary appears to have made a more liberal proposal than Austria with regard to Montenegro. But the British Plenipotentiaries supported the Austrian proposal as against the proposal of Turkey.

I now pass to Servia. A question arose with respect to the annexation of a very small district to Servia under the name of Vranja. It was apparently a matter of limited account ; but, however limited it was, we find, as usual, the British Plenipotentiary on the side hostile to the emancipation of the people, and a piece of the district had to be cut off in order to neutralize his opposition. A further question arose with respect to Servia. It had already been required by the Congress that she should, in respect of the territory added to her, bear a portion of the Turkish Debt. This was quite right ; but there was a further question, whether she should still be liable to pay tribute to Turkey—that is, to pay it by redeeming it in a capitalized form. I do not enter into any review of the conduct of Servia in this matter ; but I look simply to what has taken place in the Congress. Servia had obtained her freedom fairly and adequately in a military sense, by

the share which she took in the Russian campaign. Why was she to be saddled with the liability of paying tribute to Turkey, when she had effected her own liberation? So thought the Congress; but not so thought the British Plenipotentiaries; and here the British Plenipotentiaries are found, as they are always found when there is a practical issue, on the side least favourable to freedom.

I now come to the question of the cession to Russia of a portion of Bessarabia, which she had lost in 1856, and which she required to be restored at the cost of Roumania. When we arrive at the discussion of this question in the Congress we find that the British Plenipotentiary delivered an eloquent speech against the separation of Bessarabia; but this speech was made before an assembly of gentlemen who had been previously informed, on unquestionable authority, that England had already made known her intention to agree to the Russian demands, unless Russia, persuaded by British rhetoric, should think fit to recede from them. I admit that a protest was made in brave words. Braver words one could not wish; but they were words alone. The British Government, so far as we know, had taken the lead in assuring Russia that she had only to hold to her point and that Bessarabia should again be hers.

But let us take the matter upon the most favourable issue. The British Government had thus reluctantly been compelled to perform, or to sanction, a cruel act towards Roumania. Surely, then, it was quite obvious that in all other matters it would do the best it could for Roumania. Well, Sir, there arrived an opportunity for testing its intentions in a practical manner. There arose a question with regard to the imposition of a tribute upon Roumania, or, which is the same thing, of a pecuniary redemption of tribute similar to that which had arisen in the case of Servia. Now, Sir, nothing in the world could be clearer, nothing higher, than the title of Roumania. She had committed no act liable to an imputation of bad faith towards Turkey. During the whole of the earlier troubles, during the whole war of 1876, she had steadily maintained tranquillity, and had done nothing to add to the embarrassments of the Porte. When she did enter into the war in 1877, it was under circumstances which amounted very nearly to physical, and, at the very least, to a full moral, compulsion. Having taken her part, she fought with a gallantry surpassed by none. Unaccustomed to arms, her children acted in such a manner as would have done credit to veteran

warriors, and to a nation inured to military pursuits. If ever a country fairly and honestly had gained its independence, it was Roumania ; and yet there arose for Roumania, also, this question of tribute to Turkey. The Congress determined that Roumania should not pay any such tribute ; but even here there was an opponent, and that opponent was the British Minister.

I say then, Sir, that in this Congress of the Great Powers the voice of England has not been heard in unison with the institutions, the history, and the character of England. On every question that arose, and that became a subject of serious contest in the Congress, or that could lead to any important practical result, a voice had been heard from Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury which sounded in the tones of Metternich, and not in the tones of Mr. Canning, or of Lord Palmerston, or of Lord Russell. I do not mean that the British Government ought to have gone to the Congress determined to insist upon the unqualified prevalence of what I may call British ideas. They were bound to act in consonance with the general view of Europe. But within the limits of fair differences of opinion, which will always be found to arise on such occasions, I do affirm that it was their part to take the side of liberty ; and I do also affirm that, as a matter of fact, they took the side of servitude.

I come now, Sir, to the question of Greece, with respect to which we have already had some remarkable experience. My noble friend <sup>1</sup> stated, most ably, the case with respect to Greece, so far as it stood upon the Protocols ; but my hon. friend the Member for Chelsea enlarged on that statement by particulars which, at the time, were imperfectly authenticated, and he was at once challenged by the Under-Secretary of State. The question, however, which was put to him was, whether those particulars were included in the Protocols ? They were not so included. Yet the Under-Secretary of State, when he rose, did not contradict the statement of the hon. Member for Chelsea.<sup>2</sup> The noble Lord<sup>3</sup> who has followed to-night on the side of the Government, has not contradicted it. I have myself received information which tends to corroborate that statement. I must now regard it as a statement substantially authenticated, at any rate, until it shall have been pointedly dealt with by the Government. Let me consider, then, Sir, what, according to that statement, combined with the contents of the Protocols, is the history of the relation between England and Greece in respect to this most im-

<sup>1</sup> Lord Hartington.      <sup>2</sup> Sir Charles Dilke.      <sup>3</sup> Viscount Sandon.

portant matter? The Greeks formed an opinion that they were entitled, under the circumstances of their ethnical relationship, to the possession of Thessaly, Epirus, and Crete. I know not upon what conditions of tribute or otherwise they were to be taken over from Turkey, and I do not enter into those details. Well, what did Her Majesty's Government declare under those circumstances? It has been stated that at a former time they had informed the Greeks that they must not look to territorial acquisitions. I have nothing to do with the former time. I look to the Circular Despatch, written by Lord Salisbury, on the 8th of last June. That despatch contains the authentic and formal instructions of Her Majesty's Government to the Plenipotentiaries, and at page 3 of the Book of Protocols, hon. gentlemen will find the short passage to which I now refer. Lord Salisbury there says—knowing perfectly at the time what were the claims of Greece—

“The claims which will no doubt be advanced by the Government of Greece, in reference to some of these Provinces, will receive the careful consideration of Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary, and will, no doubt, also receive the careful consideration of the other Powers.”

Now, I want to know whether those words did not bind the British Government to favour some not inconsiderable territorial claims?

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the right hon. gentleman read the whole of the paragraph?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am perfectly willing to read it, but it would waste the time of the House, and it has no relation whatever to the subject. Now, let us see what actually took place, and what sort of careful consideration was given by the British Plenipotentiary to the claims of Greece. I refer, of course, not merely to the Protocols, but to the preliminary *pourparlers*; and I say that the information, as it is now before us, is to the following effect:—The French Government, through its Plenipotentiaries, made a proposal, and endeavoured to obtain the assent of Europe to the proposal, that Thessaly and Epirus should be added to Greece. The particular condition of the arrangements we do not know; but they are matters of comparatively small consequence, which might and ought to have been treated, as I think, in a manner liberal to Turkey. This proposal of the French Plenipotentiaries, as we are given to understand, was met by a counter proposal of the English Plenipotentiaries; and they, instead of handing over Thessaly and Epirus to Greece, proposed—as we are

now told by Lord Beaconsfield—to extend the frontier of Greece in the manner now described in the Treaty of Berlin. The French found their suggestion resisted by England, and they thought it expedient—nor can we wonder at, or blame, their conduct—to abandon it accordingly. But was that proceeding of England agreeable to the traditions of England upon this particular subject? I have stated in this House before what I now state again, what I know as matter of personal experience, and what is known likewise to official persons living, and connected, at least, with one other Power. Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell, on the cession of the Ionian Islands, sustained by the opinion of all their colleagues, were desirous to take practical measures in the year 1862 for procuring the cession of Epirus and Thessaly to Greece. The Porte was unwilling to agree. There was no disturbance in Turkey at the time, and the Porte never makes any concession, except under the pressure of political necessity. I am not making a complaint against Turkey; I am only stating why, at that period, the plan did not take effect; but the tradition of England and its former intention were entirely abandoned on this occasion. The proposal was left to the Plenipotentiaries of France; and when it was made by them, it was resisted by the Plenipotentiaries of England. We are now told that what I may call the minor proposal—that is to say, the frontier described in the Treaty of Berlin, was the original proposal of Lord Salisbury. This statement is not sustained by anything that appears in the volume of the Protocols. But this is not all. This minor proposal is not a definite proposal at all; it is only a recommendation to the Porte, though some say it is a recommendation of a binding character. Some information has been supplied to me with regard to the diplomatic force of the French word *inviter*, and certainly it seems that *inviter* is a word that is occasionally, perhaps frequently, employed in an ultimatum; so that if you invite, in the French tongue, another party in a negotiation to accede to something, it means that if he does not accede you will compel him to submit. However, I pass on with the expression of the hope that these words will be found strong enough to carry force with them; but I wish to refer to what Lord Beaconsfield said about them, in a speech on Saturday last. The French Plenipotentiaries, having been defeated in the larger plan, adopted the smaller one, and proposed it to the Congress. When it was so proposed, although we are now told it was the original proposal of Lord Salisbury, the first Plenipotentiary of England said it was open to objection:

but he consented to waive the objection in deference to, or for the sake of, procuring the unanimity of the Congress. Thus far, Sir, we perceive nothing but a persistent hostility, limited only by the more favourable desires of others, on the part of England to the pretensions of Greece. Lord Beaconsfield, who said a limited concession to Greece was open to objection, has not relinquished his idea. Indeed, it is but justice to him to say that he very seldom does relinquish any idea. And on Saturday last, in order, apparently, to reduce to nothing, if he could, the value of what the Congress has done for Greece, he stated in a speech that the Congress declared it did not feel justified in appealing to the Sultan to adopt even a step which might prove advantageous to his own interests ; but that it expressed an opinion which he doubted not the Sultan was prepared to consider, in that spirit of conciliation which he had so often displayed. Here are two points—first, the spirit of conciliation displayed by the Sultan ; secondly, the intention which, Lord Beaconsfield said, the Congress declared not to coerce him. What is the spirit of conciliation the Sultan has so often displayed ? Is it that spirit in which he rejected the recommendations of the Conference at Constantinople ? Is it that spirit in which he rejected the Protocol of London, toned down to the feeblest and most limited form consistent with any assertion of a practical interest on behalf of the subject races ? Is it that spirit in which, when Lord Derby made an urgent application for the punishment of the Bulgarian assassins, the Sultan met him by adopting a course which saved every man among them of the slightest consequence from capital punishment, or any severe punishment, and which, in regard to the arch-assassin of them all, Chefket Pasha, at whom Lord Derby had particularly pointed, exhibited itself by selecting him for almost immediate honour and promotion ? This is the spirit of conciliation which the Sultan has displayed. It is his calamity as much as his fault. He is the unhappy heir of bad traditions and of triumphant wrong. Now, let me exhibit the effect of Lord Beaconsfield's last declaration. He says the Congress has declared it did not feel justified in compelling the Sultan to adopt any step with respect to Greece. I want to know where the Congress has made that declaration ? I say, if it has made such a declaration, I cannot find it on record. If it be upon the record, I beg of you, here, and now, to point it out. I do not wish to detain you by any inaccurate assertion, but I have sought for it in vain. I find no such declaration upon the record. Why is it alleged in the speech of the Prime Min-

ister? Is it thus alleged in order to have the same effect on the coming negotiations between Greece and Turkey, as the occasional or unofficial messages conveyed during the Conference at Constantinople, to the effect that England would not be, in any circumstances, a party to compelling Turkey to do that which the Conference had recommended? We remember the effect of those messages, the lively expressions of gratitude which they produced from the Sultan and from the Grand Vizier. As far as the facts go, the recent declaration of the Prime Minister, wholly unsupported by anything on the Protocols—nay, at variance with the Protocols as they stand—the recent declaration was probably intended to convey to the mind of the Sultan that, so far as England is concerned, he is perfectly safe, may do what he pleases, and need not give to Greece an acre or a yard of land. Surely such an intimation merits another of those grateful telegrams from the Grand Vizier and from the Sultan. Such, Sir, is the case with Greece, as it stands upon the evidence at present before us. The statement of it does not require to be heightened by the use of epithets—it is sufficiently exhibited by the facts.

I come now, Sir, to the Agreement made between Lord Salisbury and Count Schouvaloff. And I wish to ask the Government, at this part of the case, in what manner they reconcile the conclusion of that Agreement with the distinct professions upon which they had been standing for three or four months before in the face of Europe? Nothing had so much excited the public mind in the early part of this year as the notion that there were, or might be, secret Articles of Agreement between Russia and Turkey. It would have been so wicked—would it not?—for Russia to have made a secret agreement in conjunction with the Treaty of San Stefano. But at last this phantom was laid. The Russians declared, in the most explicit language, that they, at any rate, had no secret Agreement. We then contended that the whole matter of the Treaty of San Stefano was for the free, full, unbiassed consideration of Europe; it modified European law, and, therefore, it must go fully and freely to the consideration of Europe. Did it go fully and freely to the consideration of Europe? No; a secret Agreement was made between Russia and England; for all we know, it may have been intended that it should continue a secret Agreement, even down to the conclusion of the proceedings of the Congress. We owe the acquisition of a most valuable piece of knowledge, by the publication of this Agreement, to an agent to whom we are, I conceive, not particularly anxious to owe

anything at all. Through that agent we came rapidly to the knowledge of its contents ; and we found that, after all that had been said about the free deliberation of Europe, two of the Powers who were, or thought themselves most interested in the whole matter, had consented together, in binding terms, as to the limits within which, not upon one or two, but upon every one of the most essential points, their action in the Congress was to be confined. Is that proceeding between two such Powers compatible with the full and free reference of the entire Treaty to Europe ? It appears to me, I frankly own, that these two things are not compatible ; nor will I rest satisfied with an opinion. I will go back to a precedent ; I will cite the precedent of the Berlin Memorandum. Why was it, that when you refused the Berlin Memorandum—and that most unwisely, as I thought—you offered no substitute for it ? In that unconditional refusal, as I have never dissembled, you clearly carried with you, to a very great extent indeed, the approval of the people of this country. Sir, it was because that Berlin Memorandum was a preliminary Agreement between three of the Powers of Europe ; it was because England had been shut out from the preliminary declaration and conclusion ; because it was felt, and justly felt, that a preliminary Agreement between some of the Powers on questions of importance, even although the supreme jurisdiction of Europe might, in the most explicit terms, be reserved, yet, notwithstanding, was a measure that greatly tended to limit the practical freedom and the legitimate authority of Europe in dealing with the entire question. I do not say you resisted the preliminary Memorandum on this ground exclusively. You set forth a number of arguments upon the case—arguments very far, in my opinion, from being conclusive. But that, I believe, was the ground on which the country supported you. Having resisted the Berlin Memorandum on that ground, and then having insisted that Russia should carry the whole of that Treaty without prejudice and without restraint into the counsels of Europe, you then proceeded to agree with Russia upon a secret instrument, which limited the discretion of two of the greatest Agents that were to appear in the Congress, by a compact binding each of them to the other, and thereby necessarily limiting the discretion of Europe itself. Sir, I should be very glad to know how, with reference to this part of the case, the Government can show the proceedings in the matter of the Salisbury-Schouvaloff Agreement to be conformable to that perfect good faith which ought to prevail in all the trans-

actions of the Powers ; which ought, especially, to prevail between this Power and the rest of Europe ; and to which I, for one, had fondly dreamed that this country would cling, even were every other Power to show itself ready to compromise the high standard of its principles.

The last great subject before us to-night, and unfortunately the largest and most complex of all, and which, even if a long speech were exclusively devoted to it, could not be exhaustively discussed, is the Anglo-Turkish Convention. I am sorry to say, it is, perhaps, the most painful subject. I wish to say this plainly and to give my reasons for what I say, waiting and hoping to be confuted, if happily I may be confuted ; ready to apologize if I speak in terms stronger than our debates shall require, upon these proceedings, which appear to me to lie entirely outside, not only the limits of all former precedents, but the limits of all rational policy. I believe this Convention to be a complete and absolute novelty in our political history ; partly as to its contents and aims, and partly as to the manner in which it has been concluded, and upon which I am bound to say I feel even more strongly than with respect to its contents.

Now, Sir, what is this Convention in itself ? What I have just said is applicable to a certain construction of it ; but there are two constructions of it, and they are wide as the poles asunder. If you take it according to one of these constructions, then, I think, it justifies the very strongest epithets that can be used as to its unprecedented, and even its monstrous, character. If you take it according to the other description, it becomes a poor shadowy product, of an uncertain and precarious life, which may perhaps die of inanition at any moment, excepting, by-the-by, upon one single point—the possession of Cyprus. It is provided, in the Convention, that if Russia shall surrender her territorial acquisitions in Asia, then Great Britain shall surrender Cyprus ; but it is not provided that if Great Britain gives up the prosecution of the gigantic task to which she has committed herself in Asiatic Turkey, from the Black Sea down to the Persian Gulf, and to the Southern bounds of Arabia, that then also she shall, upon her desisting from her task, surrender Cyprus. Excepting in the case of a surrender by Russia, Cyprus would be, so far as it goes, a solid residuum.

I am bound to state that, upon the evidence of the facts, it appears to me that the acquisition of Cyprus has been the Alpha and the Omega of the conclusion of this Convention. The noble

Lord<sup>1</sup> holds us responsible for having been sufficiently informed as to this acquisition. He says it was spoken of in the newspapers. One newspaper wrote of Mitylene, another of Cyprus, another of Egypt, another of the coast of Syria. Therefore, says the noble Lord, in consequence of those isolated notices and comments, we ought to have been prepared for the production of the scheme now before us. This scheme, says he, is only a conditional Agreement ; we have only demanded of Turkey that she should perform certain great operations. She has agreed to do so by-and-by. It is extremely likely that she may not perform them, and if she does not perform them we retire, and in retiring we have a convenient Island in the Mediterranean, which some people think may be very valuable to us. I do not agree in that opinion ; but the Convention, in that case, would be reduced to very moderate dimensions. I am not sure whether this is the reading of the Convention adopted by the noble Lord. I am afraid it is not a true reading as adopted by Her Majesty's Government generally. It may be one not unreasonable. I do not believe that Turkey can or will perform the conditions that must be exacted of her ; and, therefore, it appears, on this mode of construing the instrument, that the obligation towards Turkey may lapse and determine.

But then we have professed to enter into that obligation on the ground that the maintenance of Turkey in Asia is necessary for British interests. If so, it may happen that we may be compelled, in the view of Her Majesty's Government, to adopt this Convention under the more substantial of its two positive forms. We are not to assume the Government of Asiatic Turkey. We are to proceed upon certain plans which the Under-Secretary of State says he will not produce. He seems entirely to forget that all these things have been planned ten times over at earlier dates. He forgets that a perfect scheme of reform for Turkey was published in the year 1839 ; and that another perfect scheme was published in 1856, after it had been framed under the advice of men of quite as high character, and quite as strong wits, as any of those who have taken part, or who are likely to take part, in the present proceedings. The Hatti Humayoun of 1856 is, as I believe, at this moment the law of Asia Minor, the law of Syria and Mesopotamia, and of Turkish Arabia. Are you going to repeal that law ? Do you mean to sweep away all that was done by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe ? You are going to undertake an enormous

<sup>1</sup> Viscount Sandon.

work. The Prime Minister says that you mean to produce order and prosperity out of chaos and anarchy. The noble Lord, in an elegant peroration, which proved to me so strongly the extent of his imaginative powers, developed largely the view of the Prime Minister. To produce order and prosperity out of chaos and anarchy—out of the chaos and anarchy of 18,000,000 of people dispersed over a territory larger than Western Europe, is what is undertaken by Her Majesty's Government. All this they are to do, not with the united authority of Europe—they are to do it single-handed ; they are to do it by the force of moral suasion ; they are to do it by the force of that moral suasion which they have been employing for years, without the smallest effect, in pressing and urging Turkey to reform her government. What is the condition, all this time, of our own public affairs ? Have we, the British nation, a great spare fund of energy applicable to this gigantic purpose ? Why, Sir, our public affairs are in such a condition—I do not say it is mainly owing to the action of the present Government—but they have been taxing their brains to discover this and that Liliputian method of expediting the labours of the House of Commons, which is already over-taxed more and more egregiously from year to year. Our own business is in enormous, and I fear, hopeless, arrear. Obstruction has become a most powerful instrument, which is due in a large measure to this arrear. Yet they are not afraid to undertake new and also boundless responsibilities. Turkey in Asia is to be managed as an outpost of British power ; it is to be maintained and to be reformed. We have never been able to reform Turkey at all. We have never been able to effect reform in India, even with absolute power in our hands, through the medium of a Native Government. We have always been compelled, in order to effect reform, to take the direct Administration and Sovereignty into our hands. We are now going to attempt that which is wholly unheard of. An immense military responsibility is likewise to be cast on us. We are to defend, at the moment when Russia shall please to attack it, a frontier of a difficult and almost inaccessible character, 2,000 or 3,000 miles distant from our own resources, but continuous with the whole mass of the unbroken territory of Russia. Together with this military responsibility, we undertake a complete social and political transformation. We are to reconstruct the police of Turkey, the Judicature, the fiscal system, and the Civil Service. Memory fails me in the attempt to enumerate all the many-sided particulars of Ministerial benevolence.

We are to reform the appointment of Governors, and, finally, we are to staunch all the fountain-heads of corruption in Constantinople itself, which have hitherto vitiated all the benevolent schemes that have been formed for the improvement of Turkey. This is the plan proposed for our acceptance, not for our own free consideration, but for our acceptance upon the responsibility of the Government. The proceedings of the Government have been carefully concealed from us in their inception and negotiation—concealed from us until the disclosure of them was of no use, weight, or value, because the full force of the Covenant, whatever that Covenant may be, has already been brought to bear upon us by the action of the Administration. Sir, I do not disparage the importance of reform in Turkey; but we ought to have regard to the amount of that which we undertake, to the success which we have hitherto achieved, to the means which we can bring to bear upon its accomplishment; for otherwise we run the most serious risk of practising delusion upon ourselves and others, delusion which, at a certain point, degenerates even into imposture.

What are the reasons for this unheard-of—nay, in the sense I have described, this mad undertaking? I want to know at what period of history, and by what British statesman, such an act as this has ever been done? I have had some knowledge of those who have taken the leading part in the foreign affairs of this country for the last forty years. I have sat in the Cabinet by the side of the Duke of Wellington, of Sir Robert Peel, of Lord Aberdeen, of Sir James Graham, of Lord Lansdowne, of Lord Palmerston, of Lord Clarendon, and of Lord Russell. I have known their modes of looking at these affairs; I have known the measure which they took of the rights, and duties, and powers of England, and of the limitations placed by a higher authority on all human power. Knowing the men, and the modes of action of the men, I do not hesitate to say that there was not one of them who would for one moment have consented to look at such a scheme as has been contrived and accomplished in the dark, by the Members of Her Majesty's present Government. It would be presumptuous for me, were I to speak, in the face of hon. gentlemen opposite, in a tone equally confident of the late Lord Derby; but I have sat also with the late Lord Derby in the Cabinet of Sir Robert Peel, and I have the strongest conviction that if such a scheme had been presented to him he would, like his distinguished son, have entirely declined to be responsible for it, in part or in whole, as a device not within the limits of rational or practical politics.

Now, Sir, let us look at some of the reasons which have been given for undertaking some of these extraordinary responsibilities. The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs <sup>1</sup> says that other people have assumed responsibilities, and shall we take none? He seems to complain that we are entirely without responsibility. I had thought that in the condition of the British Empire we were tolerably well supplied. He says Russia is going to assume responsibilities. What responsibilities is Russia about to assume? For nine months she is to retain possession by her troops of the territories that they occupy, and after that she will act only in concurrence and in partnership with Europe. What separate responsibility has Russia undertaken? Has the Under-Secretary got another Schouvaloff Memorandum, not yet disclosed to us? No other responsibility of Russia is mentioned in the Protocols or in the Treaty. But Austria is going to undertake responsibilities. Undoubtedly she is. She will be responsible for a territory of limited extent, inhabited by 1,200,000 or 1,500,000 people, and that territory already surrounded, as to more than half its circumference, by her own territory. This responsibility she has undertaken, in the face of day, by the mandate of Europe. Her mode of obtaining it, whatever I may think of her general policy, has been perfectly honourable. No one is entitled to find the slightest fault with her procedure. She has obtained the consent of Europe, and the authority of Europe; her task is, at any rate, within limits; she is not going to take charge of half a continent; she is not going to proceed under an agreement with closed doors, and imposed by her Executive Government upon her own people, on its own single responsibility.

So much for the responsibilities of others. But the Under-Secretary has produced an argument much more extraordinary even than this. I really felt, when he used it last night, that there was something in it in full harmony with the high-coloured Oriental character of these proceedings. The hon. gentleman has discovered that Russia is in the greatest possible want of recruiting ground; she has such a small population and so very few men in proportion to her means of subsistence. Now, Sir, I have always been under an impression, in which I must have been completely wrong. My impression had hitherto been that Russia was a country with comparatively small means of subsistence, and a comparatively large number of inhabitants. Were this so, the business of recruiting is the easiest operation that could be con-

<sup>1</sup> Hon. Robert Bourke.

ceived. It is also backed by the system of conscription. But as to the character of the recruiting ground of the hon. gentleman, which he really might have drawn by copying from *The Arabian Nights*, I tell him this,—that, if he has not got information contrary to mine, so far from Russia getting or requiring recruiting ground in Armenia, Russia, long ago in possession of Georgia, has not even extended her ordinary system of conscription to the South of the Caucasus. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to contradict this statement? I have learned that the country of Georgia, into which I believe a year ago, or two years ago, Russia had not thought it worth while to extend her conscription, is a better territory for recruiting, has more population, and is better able to yield her soldiers, inhabited as it is exclusively by Christians, than that Armenia which has possessed and inflamed the imagination of the hon. gentleman, and filled him with terrors, lest Russia should make use of it for her recruiting ground. Russia has not even carried her own system of recruiting into her present territory, towards the frontier of Turkey, and yet the hon. gentleman tells us that it is her great scheme to acquire this Turkish territory, evidently less adapted for the purpose, to supply a poverty of men which does not exist, and under which she has never suffered, and is not likely to suffer. A more extraordinary piece of information than that given by the hon. gentleman, proceeding as it does from an official source, can hardly be imagined. But I do not blame the hon. gentleman. I believe that this strange conception is entirely owing to the poverty of his materials. It is, in reality, of a piece with the general idea and structure of that singular production which is called the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and which I am convinced will be the astonishment—it may possibly be the calamity—of our children and of our children's children.

It would not be well, Sir, however, that the whole business of supplying arguments should fall upon the Under-Secretary. The Secretary of State has also made a contribution towards the discovery of reasons to be observed in favour of this scheme. It is to be found in the despatch which has been for some days in our hands. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs considers that throughout Asia Minor, as a consequence of the recent war, there will be a great disintegration of Ottoman rule, amounting nearly to a dissolution of society, so that if there is to be any hope of order or peace in that country, there is an absolute necessity for some kind of intervention. Now, Sir, in the first place, I beg you

to compare this most deplorable state of things with the other reports which we have heard as to the concentration of the Turkish Empire. Why, if the Turkish Empire is concentrated, as is insisted upon by Her Majesty's Government, and not "partitioned," as other and foolish people have imagined, just as that concentration would enable the Ottoman Power to manage its affairs in Europe with more efficiency, why should it not do the same thing in Asia? The Turkish Empire will be concentrated in Asia, as an effect of the concentration in Europe, and will be concentrated in Asia by the abstraction of the territory which Russia has taken from it. But that is not all. In Europe the concentrated territory is to be administered under great difficulty by a minority of Mahommedans among a majority of Christians, by a Government of the Turkish fashion, with Governments of a very different and far better fashion upon the frontiers at short distances. In European Turkey the Porte has constantly been troubled by revolts. In Asia, so far from her having greater difficulties to contend with, her difficulties are infinitely less. Who has heard of revolts in Asia Minor or in Mesopotamia? Who are the inhabitants of Asia Minor in its centre? I do not speak of Armenia; but even in Armenia the Armenians are in a minority. Who, I ask, are the inhabitants of Central Asia Minor? They are the best and most solid of the Mahommedan population in the whole of the Turkish Empire except that of Mesopotamia and the extreme South-east. Will the hon. gentleman venture to contradict my statement? I am quite sure he cannot; and yet my statement is one which, if it be true, is perfectly fatal to the argument of the Secretary of State. Kurdistan may be a lawless tract; but I do not speak of Kurdistan, I speak of Central Asia Minor. Captain Burnaby is a good witness to call. I hope I may call him so, because he has been led accidentally to put into my mouth all manner of things which I never said, and consequently I hope that the mention of his name will be received with much favour by hon. gentlemen opposite. He is without doubt a competent observer of things which fall within his own view. He has given a very interesting account of his ride through the heart of Asia Minor, and he writes that it is inhabited by a population mainly of Mahommedans, and enthusiastic in its loyalty to the dynasty and the Mahommedan religion. The fact is, that there is no evidence of the state of things stated by Lord Salisbury; it is entirely due to his imagination. This has been the least troubled portion of the Turkish Empire. Bad government prevails in it,

but only as it prevails everywhere. Who has ever heard before of the doctrine set up by Lord Salisbury? Show me the documents in the voluminous records of the Foreign Office, of any anterior period, which are in harmony with this despatch of Lord Salisbury, and which represent a specially hopeless state of things in the interior of Asia Minor. I cannot but affirm that it is a despatch made to meet the case. I do not mean that Lord Salisbury has not persuaded himself of the truth of the statement he has made; but he is in a position of great difficulty—he has to find a justification for an extraordinary and an unheard-of measure. Rebellions in Asia Minor are things unheard of. Grievances in Asia Minor have never yet produced that result. Your own witness (Captain Burnaby) is against you, and there is not the smallest pretence for saying that society in Asia Minor is in a condition of anarchy in a sense inapplicable to other portions of the Turkish Empire. And if it were so, this Convention does not refer to Asia Minor alone; it refers just as much to Syria, and Mesopotamia, and Arabia.

But the noble Lord says—"You have not given us an alternative policy!" My answer is, the Congress itself, so far as Armenia is concerned, has concurred in providing an alternative policy, and one most rational. Here is one of the most extraordinary among all the extraordinary parts of this unexampled proceeding. The principle of British policy for very many years has been to regulate everything relating to Turkey, so far as it was to be touched at all, by the common consent of Europe. On that principle the Treaty of Berlin has been framed with regard to the Province of Armenia. All the Powers that have signed that Treaty have taken from the Sultan an engagement for the good government of Armenia, and they are one and all entitled to enforce that engagement. With regard, then, to the very same matters and at the very same time, the same Government has been a party to providing for two totally different jurisdictions—the one of a higher and the other of a lower authority; the one of European authority, with the consent of Turkey, the other of the authority of a single Power, with that same consent. Each of these may come, and is likely to come, into conflict with Turkey; but they may come also into conflict with one another. On the 4th of June you signed a Treaty with the Sultan, under which the Sultan binds himself to you to settle with you certain reforms that are to be introduced into Armenia, among other countries. On the 13th of July you signed another Treaty of

Berlin, with the Sultan also, and with a great many other Powers, representing an authority far higher than that to which you and the Sultan can pretend ; and this authority, with perfect parity among its members, provides that the Sultan, in concert with each and with the whole of them, shall introduce reforms into Armenia. What security have you, or have we, that these two authorities are to arrive at the same judgment on the reforms ? There is very little doubt which of the two is superior. You may well talk of an alternative policy. You have provided, so far as Armenia is concerned, an alternative and a conflicting policy yourselves.

And how came this about ? What we find is, that you had made your own secret arrangements with Turkey, withdrawn from the knowledge of the European Powers, and when the question of Armenia was raised in the Congress at Berlin, you were apparently not in a condition to disclose to the Congress—at all events, you did not disclose—that which you already had agreed upon for Turkey. The consequence of your alternative policy was that the Congress at Berlin adopted a system totally different to that to which you had agreed. The doctrine of the Government is that something was to be done. But something was done. The Sultan was already under obligations to Europe to execute reforms in Asiatic Turkey by the Treaty of 1856. If we wished to give effect to that obligation, why did not we invoke the authority of Europe ? Is it not higher and stronger than ours ? Do we mean to set up our own authority as greater than that of Europe ? Do you think that we have a monopoly of humanity ? Has our conduct, with regard to Turkey, been such as to show that the care of the subject-populations has been our interest alone, or has been more studiously propagated by us than by other Powers of Christendom ? Do you think that intervention in the Sultan's affairs is prejudicial and unwise when it is attempted by others, but beneficent and wise when done by you single-handed ? Now, suppose that the Sultan had made an agreement with Russia, to do, in a certain portion of his territory, that which he has agreed with you to do in far the larger part of it. Suppose a Russian Minister had said—"We are going to reform the Judicature, the police, the finances, the Civil Service of Turkey, and stop the progress of corruption in Constantinople." Would you have commended Russia for taking that course ? Would you have allowed Russia to take that course ? No, nor yet to do a tenth part of what you have done. You would have inflamed the country and called out your Reserves, and adopted

your military measures. Sir, the whole tendency of what Her Majesty's Government has done is to establish one law for others, and another for ourselves. Lord Salisbury has been speaking with some contempt of the philosophical historian, and he has said—if he be correctly reported—that the philosophical historian has often given countenance to wild and speculative ideas, which are not suited for the councils of statesmen. In my own opinion, the philosophical historian, when he gets his turn—and he will get his turn—will make a very formidable rejoinder; he will say that it is from the councils of statesmen, or councils which are called such, that, upon this occasion, there has proceeded the most extraordinary crop of wild and speculative ideas which were ever grown in the hottest of all the hot-houses of politics.

What, Sir, are the Ministerial representations of this design? It is said that, in order to defend the Turkish frontier from Russia, England must watch over the good government of Turkey in Asia; and, in order to enable her to watch over it effectually, she must take possession of Cyprus. I should not be at all surprised if the philosophic historian, when he comes to handle the subject, should be inclined to give a totally different version of the matter, and should repeat it in a manner something like this. No doubt, he will greatly improve the form; but he may say something of this sort—"England"—that is to say, an English Ministry—"wanted to get possession of Cyprus, that it might have something to show to the people of England, by way of averting the reproach of defeat, or of presenting the semblance of triumph. In order to induce the Sultan to make them a present of Cyprus, they undertook to defend the Turkish frontier against Russia; and in order to make the defence of that frontier decent, in a philanthropic point of view, they took from the Sultan stipulations for the good government of Asia," which all experience had shown to be worthless.

I cannot complain, Sir, that we have had no explanation of the motives which induced the Sultan to enter into this Convention. The hon. gentleman the Under-Secretary of State,<sup>1</sup> in a moment of candour and great communicativeness—a quality in regard to which Her Majesty's Government have not signally erred on the side of excess—last night, did allow himself to tell us why it was that this Convention had been especially kept back from our knowledge. It was for this reason—If it had gone forth to the world, some ill-inclined persons would have persuaded the

<sup>1</sup> Hon. Robert Bourke.

Sultan not to sign it. It was necessary, in order to make sure of the Sultan's signing it, that it should be done in the dark. That is not my statement ; it is the statement of the hon. gentleman who made it on the part of the Government. But why is it not good for the Sultan, as it is for everybody else, that he should do what he is called upon to do, after every opportunity of knowledge and information ? If it had been known that this Convention was in the course of being negotiated, then there, as here, all the world would have had an opportunity of giving an opinion, and of giving information upon it. " No," says the hon. gentleman, " that would have been utterly fatal ; the Sultan would never have signed it. Secrecy was necessary in order to bring him to such a point." And is that, Sir, the account given by a British Minister of the motives for a British negotiation ? Publicity would have exhibited all the facts, opened every mouth, thrown the full light of day on the entire transaction ; but that, as we now know, in the judgment of the Government, would have been fatal to the signing of the Convention by the Sultan. It appears to me then, Sir, as I will say again, that we are truly in the region of *The Arabian Nights*, more than in the region of practical politics, as that region was known to the generation of our forefathers, or to my own earlier public life. The whole matter is so strange that, as we pass on from point to point, new wonders continually open upon us. It is not a matter of astonishment that—as has been stated so well by my hon. friend the Member for Chelsea<sup>1</sup>—a large portion of the people of England has been so silent on the subject of this Convention. I do not believe that now, in this debate, however it might be prolonged, we should be able to view it in all its lights, or to open up one-half of the contingencies, or one-half of the dangers which, in the real and substantial conception of the scheme, it involves.

But, Sir, passing on from the matters which this Convention contains, I go to what is, if possible, more serious ; and I want to know from Her Majesty's Government what is really their doctrine, and their view, about the binding force of Treaties ? Upon this subject I am entirely and hopelessly confused. This country made a Declaration on the 17th January, 1871. I now tell Her Majesty's Government that I am going to attack their title, in point of honour and good faith, to conclude the Anglo-Turkish Convention in the way in which it was concluded. I say that they had no title. I say that the Convention, as it stands, is an offence

<sup>1</sup> Sir Charles Dilke.

against European law. I say that upon their own principles it has no legal force until the Powers of Europe shall have agreed to it. I want to know the opinion of the Government upon that subject, and if they do not agree with the opinion I have now given, I want to know how they could depart from a principle of their own which they have laid down in their own language, and on which they have strongly insisted during the present year? I go back, Sir, however, to the 17th January, 1871. The Assembly of Plenipotentiaries spoke thus—

“ They recognize that it is one essential principle of the law of nations that no Power can liberate itself from the engagements of a Treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the contracting Powers by means of an amicable agreement.”

Now, Sir, I desire to know whether the Convention of the 4th of June does, or does not, modify those stipulations. I say that the cession of Cyprus to England—veil it as you like under the terms of “ occupation ” and “ administration ”—the delivery of Cyprus into the power of England, and all that legislative power over Cyprus, which you are going to claim, and which you are going to exercise—I presume under the authority of the Sultan—is totally at variance with both the spirit and letter of the Declaration of London, in its application to the Treaty of Paris. By the Treaty of Paris, every Power in Europe is bound to take an interest in that question, for it bears upon the integrity of the Turkish Empire. It is a matter of common concern, and particular signatory Powers have no right to deal with it by separate arrangement. Supposing that Russia had taken Mitylene; juridically, the question would have just been the same, and it would then have been true, as it is now true, that her assumption of it had no legal validity without the assent of Europe. That is not my opinion alone. What was your own language a few weeks ago? Lord Derby said, on the 8th of March, in this year, on your behalf, in a despatch—

“ It will be desirable to have it understood, in the first place, that no alteration in the state of things previously established by Treaty should be acknowledged as valid, until it has received the assent of the Powers.”

That was the language of Lord Derby on the 8th of March. Accordingly, the alterations made by the Treaty of San Stefano in the state of things previously established have either been reversed, or have since received the assent of the Powers of Europe. But what title have you to make other alterations on your own motion only? If you may thus act, may not Russia thus act?

If Russia may not thus act, what right have you to take such proceedings? If the Porte is entitled to give Cyprus over to you, is she, or is she not entitled, I ask again, to give over Mitylene to Russia? If she is entitled to do the one and not the other, show me the international and juridical grounds on which you found that difference. It is quite time that the question should be asked, and that the question should be answered. I am profoundly alarmed at the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with respect to the faith of Treaties. A few months ago they were gaining infinite credit from Europe—I admit the fact—as the champion of public law. They had made demands upon Russia which led them, undoubtedly, to a diplomatic victory. They required Russia to submit to the meeting of a Congress, on terms much narrower and closer than had been pressed on any other Power at any former period. They brought the Congress together under limitations imposed by their will—limitations which, as far as I know, had never been previously pressed upon the Parties to a European Congress. But Russia did submit; and by making their demand, and carrying their demand, Her Majesty's Government obtained credit, as the champions of public law. But what have they, since then, been doing with public law themselves? They sent their Fleet into the Dardanelles, and kept it there, even in the time of peace. Was not that a violation of public law? A hon. and learned friend of mine, the Member for the Denbigh Boroughs,<sup>1</sup> gave Notice of a question on this subject to Her Majesty's Government, impugning the legality of their act; but the Notice of his Question was received on the other side of the House with such stormy manifestations as cannot easily be forgotten. It was a simple Question on a point of law; but whether, on account of its inconvenient character, or on some other ground, this method of meeting it was adopted, and with such effect that my hon. and learned friend appears to have thought that, after all, discretion was the better part of valour, and that perhaps his Question had better not be put.

In the meantime, the British Fleet remained, and for a time, undoubtedly, without any sanction ever made known to us, within the Dardanelles in time of peace. Well, Sir, what declaration do we find before us in the Protocols, about that Article of the Treaty of London, which lays down the law of Europe with respect to the Straits? We find that Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary has taken upon himself to declare on behalf of England, without the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Watkin Williams.

consent of the other Powers of Europe, that we should determine for ourselves in what way we shall hereafter understand and construe that Article of the Treaty of London, which refers to the closing of the Dardanelles. What right has the British Plenipotentiary to make any such declaration? Lord Salisbury has inserted in the Protocols these words—

“ Considering that the Treaty of Berlin will modify an important part of the arrangements sanctioned by the Treaty of Paris of 1856, and that the interpretation of Article 2 of the Treaty of London, which is dependent on the Treaty of Paris, may thus become a matter of dispute :—‘ I declare on behalf of England that the obligations of Her Britannic Majesty relating to the closing of the Straits, do not go further than an engagement with the Sultan to respect in this matter His Majesty’s independent determinations in conformity with the spirit of existing Treaties.’ ”

With respect, then, Sir, to that very Treaty of London, which was concluded for the very purpose of establishing the doctrine that no single Power could either depart from, or modify, the stipulations of any engagement, England has claimed to record a declaration with regard to the closing of the Straits that she will not be bound by the letter of the Treaty, but will fall back on its spirit, and make herself alone the judge of that spirit. It seems to me that this is a breach of the Treaty; a flat violation, as it stands, of the Treaty of London. The Russian Plenipotentiaries not unnaturally met it by recording their counter-declaration that the principle of closing the Straits was a European principle, and that the stipulations concluded in this respect in 1841, 1856, and 1871, confirmed at present by the Treaty of Berlin, were binding on the part of the Powers in accordance, not with the spirit only, but with the spirit and the letter of the existing Treaties. Well, Sir, I use those citations mainly as illustrations of the vital and fundamental inquiry, what is the ground on which you claim your title to make this separate Treaty with Turkey, and to modify the law of Europe without the assent of Europe? I confess it appears to me that it is a clear infraction of the principles declared in London in 1871, and declared by yourselves in the earlier portions of the negotiations.

Now, Sir, have foreign Powers no ground to complain of the manner of our proceedings in this matter? We have brought them to Berlin under the full belief that we ourselves were there for the purpose of maintaining a very high doctrine about European law, and of contending that the provisions of 1856 were unalterable, except by European authority. Under that belief we carried them through all the important parts, or very nearly

all the important parts, of the Treaty of Berlin, and it was only at the close of the negotiations that they found out that we, in the meantime, not by European authority, not even with the knowledge of any Power in Europe, as far as we are informed, had, in concert with the Porte, and, as the Under-Secretary has told us, keeping even Turkey purposely in the dark, lest the Sultan should refuse to sign—we had altered the Treaty of 1856, behind the back of Europe, by establishing a sole Protectorate, and a single-handed right of intervention in Asiatic Turkey, and by assuming the administration and occupation of the Island of Cyprus.

Now, Sir, this was in direct contradiction to the doctrine laid down by all previous authorities, and notably by Lord Clarendon in a despatch, dated the 22nd July, 1854. Lord Clarendon says—

“ If such reforms are to be promoted by any foreign influence, it can only be by means of friendly counsel and advice, and not by an interference grounded upon Treaty engagements into which no State could enter without abdicating its independence.”

In defiance of this principle you have taken a Treaty engagement with Turkey, and you have taken it alone. Now the great object of the Crimean War, and of the Treaty of 1856, was first of all to defeat and to prevent all sole interference with Turkey whatever, and to lay down the principle that whatever concerned Turkey should be the concern, not of one Power, but of Europe. Not only so, but there was another, and a noble portion of the policy of that time, which you have completely reversed. When England and France went into the Crimean War, they went into it as the champions of public law ; and one of the first and most solemn acts which they performed was to contract a mutual engagement that, come what might, contending as they did for public law in the general interests of Europe and of civilization, neither the one nor the other should turn to her own profit the issue of the war, or use it for her own aggrandizement. What have we now done in connexion with the principle involved in that engagement ? Into the recent war we did not go. For the subject-races we lifted no arm of strength. What has been done for them has been done without us, has been done morally in spite of us. We contented ourselves with diplomatic war, not in their behalf, but against their cause. This war we carried on very actively through our Ambassador at Constantinople, against the Power engaged in the endeavour to liberate those subject-races—against her in that war, and in the best of her acts, although we aided her in her

criminal proceedings in respect to Bessarabia ; proceedings against which we protested, no doubt in the face of the Assembly at Berlin, but with a written document, known to every one of its members, that, if only she would hold to her point, we were ready to concur with her. Now, Sir, that self-denying engagement on the part of France and England was a noble and an honourable act, and it stands in the most glaring contrast with what has lately been done. It had the entire approval of the people of this country ; and I have yet to learn that the people of this country will approve of the reversal, by a stroke struck in secret, of the policy it embodied. The conduct of Her Majesty's Government in going to Berlin, and negotiating there in the guise of maintainers of that public law which they themselves knew that they had just set aside, appears to me to be of a character of which foreign Powers have a right to complain as a proceeding tainted with duplicity. It is not enough to say that no Power in Europe protests against it. It is not a very dignified thing for any great Power to protest, unless it has well considered the means it may possess of giving effect to its protests. It is not bound to protest at a given moment ; it may choose its own time ; but we are bound now, and at every time, to proceed upon the principles which we believe to be the principles of justice, and to test the conduct of the Government by the application of those principles.

Is it possible Her Majesty's Government can believe that they have been behaving in a manner worthy of England to, for example, all the Mediterranean Powers ? They say that they have spared the susceptibilities of France. I will not now speak especially of Italy, though I might do it, as she is a Power whose coasts are only in the Mediterranean ; but I speak of France. How have you spared her susceptibilities ? By making a secret contract with the Sultan, which extends to the government of the whole of Turkey in Asia, and so includes the region of Syria, of the historical relations of which with France you cannot but be aware. You have stepped in between France and her historical relations with Syria ; you have affected her position in the Mediterranean by the acquisition of Cyprus ; you have forgotten the honourable and leading part which France has already taken in matters of vital consequence connected with the internal condition of Turkey in Asia. Do you think that France has not cause to be jealous of these proceedings ? As to her declarations, I do not pretend to be in possession of authentic evidence ; but I listened with much astonishment to the language of the noble

Lord to-night. The noble Lord to-night quoted a speech of M. Gambetta, which he thought favourable to the recent policy of England ; and he said it would be admitted that M. Gambetta could not be considered as a friendly witness. Surely, Sir, the noble Lord could have given no attention whatever to the course taken by a portion of the French Press during the Eastern controversy. The reputed organ of M. Gambetta in the French Press—I speak of that which I believe is notorious—is *The République Francaise*. I have read *The République Francaise* from time to time during these transactions. I have never seen a notice in it of my own course, except in terms of the severest condemnation, and that journal has appeared to be nearly as much devoted as some of the journals of this Metropolis to the support of the policy of Her Majesty's Government upon the Eastern Question. I do not now enter into motives ; but such is the fact. *The Journal des Debats* has maintained, as far as I know, a tone nearly similar. At the same time in *The Journal des Debats*, within the last few days, I find this passage—

“ Let England represent to herself what her feelings would have been if France in the days of her power ”—

“ In the days of her power ! ” what a bitter reflection for the French writer at the moment !—

“ had done what England has just accomplished, and if she had done it in the same manner.”

Sir, had France taken such a proceeding, I know very well what England would have thought. The writer in *The Journal des Debats* goes on to refer, and to refer with perfect justice, to the opinions expressed in this country at the time as to the annexation of Savoy and of Nice. That annexation was one of trifling political consequence in itself. Nay, more ; I will venture to say, as regards Savoy, what I could not state as regards Nice, it was an annexation which was not otherwise than agreeable to the real nature of the circumstances at the time. The annexation of these two Provinces was effected under circumstances which did not cause public scandal ; yet such were the feelings aroused in this country, that I give it confidently as my opinion, that if it had not been for the commercial negotiations with France, and for the French Treaty of the same year, it is too probable that we should have found our way to war with France, out of jealousy against those annexations. A course tending manifestly in that direction was recommended in this House, not under the name of

war, but under the name of a "Continental combination" against France, from this Opposition Bench, near which I now stand, by a gentleman who then principally expressed the opinions of the Conservative Party on foreign affairs in Parliament—I mean Sir Seymour Fitzgerald. Sir, it would perhaps be agreeable neither to the recollections, nor to the hopes and aspirations of France, that she should commit herself to a protest at a time when prudence might recommend that her protest should be in words alone. But when I look back upon all the phases of this Eastern Question, I say of France, whether she protest or not, that I am grateful to France for the part she has taken on more than one occasion; and that I feel ashamed of the treatment to which she has now been subjected. The union of the Danubian Principalities, which was stoutly resisted by hon. gentlemen I see opposite, was, perhaps, the very best thing that had ever been accomplished towards the liberation of the Christian populations in the East, towards establishing a barrier against Russia, and towards the general settlement of the question, within the last twenty years. That union was mainly due to the energetic agency of France; it was likewise mainly due to France that the intervention in the case of the Lebanon was instituted, and was carried to a close with the energy which the case required.

Allow me, Sir, to point out that that intervention ought, in my opinion, to have supplied a model for the proceedings of Her Majesty's Government. If they thought that the condition of Asiatic Turkey, as I strongly think, required the notice of other Powers, it was open to them at the Congress at Berlin to have proposed that principles such as have been laid down for Armenia should be carried into effect in other portions of Asiatic Turkey, and likewise that the provisions adopted in the case of the Lebanon would have supplied a precedent for giving shape to those provisions. That history, Sir, of the mode in which the disturbances in the Lebanon were dealt with was creditable to all concerned; but it was especially creditable to France. By the use of firm language, which always has its effect with Turkey, France, England and Russia interposed to stop effectually a state of things which had reached the extremest horror in Syria. I heard to-night the description of Syria given by the noble Lord; but from that description it did not appear that he had ever so much as heard a whisper of the transactions to which I now refer. However, those transactions brought about an intervention of the Great Powers. Despatches were written, couched in in-

telligible language, and with the intention and determination that they should take effect ; not as in September, 1876, when high words were idly wasted, but in a very different temper, and with very different courage and determination. Turkey was required to execute a great criminal—a person whose rank was no less than that of a Pasha, and that Pasha was executed accordingly. Arrangements were made for the government of the Province, with respect to which, avoiding all detail, I will only say they were of such a character that, under a variety of Governors, it has since, as I believe, enjoyed at least comparative peace, order and happiness. I am happy to say that the British Government of the day vigorously co-operated to bring about those arrangements, which you have not condescended to copy, and which you have not sought the aid of Europe to extend in other portions of Turkey in Asia, choosing rather other methods of proceeding, more visibly connected with selfish and separate interests ; but I am bound also to admit that of the honour, which was reaped by the whole of the intervening Powers, the principal share due on that occasion was due, not to England, but to France. And now France, in her comparative weakness—in the days, at least, when she thinks reserve still most befits her policy—is to see us, who in that affair were content to follow in her wake, and who, on the question of the Principalities, rather resisted than aided her, step in between her and her historical associations, and the just claims growing out of them. Are you sanguine enough to believe that such facts as these will be unremembered by her in the days of her prosperity and her strength ?

But, Sir, if foreign Powers have reason to complain of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, what shall I say of that conduct in its bearing upon the dignity and the rights of Parliament ? The Treaty-making power in this country is a power of which I have some special right to speak at the present moment, because I have had the opportunity of declaring my opinions on a recent occasion, in the presence of important personages connected with Government. It is a power, Sir, of Prerogative, which in the abstract is difficult to defend ; but which has been endured because it had been uniformly used with moderation, with careful regard to precedent, with a just estimate of the rights of the people, and with due knowledge of the existing sense and convictions of the people. When it ceases to be so used, and comes to be used in another manner, it is a power that becomes, in one word, intolerable. The British Constitution instead of

being, as it has been largely admitted to be, the admiration of the world, would be, not the admiration, but the derision of the world, unless due regard were paid to the rights of Parliament in matters thus largely and profoundly affecting the welfare of the country. Now, Sir, have or have not Her Majesty's Government paid due regard to the rights of Parliament? They have yet to state their own case upon the subject; but at present it appears to me that they have made an imprudent, and even an unheard-of use of the Treaty-making power. They have gone beyond the limits of precedent; they have not adhered to known principles of action; they have not marched in concert with the convictions of the country, but have acted entirely without its knowledge or expectation. They have not only not developed and fulfilled the policy of former proceedings, but they have actually reversed that policy. The Treaty of Paris, as I have shown, rejected altogether the sole interference of any Power in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire; but you have laid hands on the Island of Cyprus, and you will keep it as long as you please; and you have taken powers under which your sole interference with Turkey will have no limit, except such as you yourselves may choose to attach to it. You have, therefore, employed your power upon principles the direct reverse of those on which Parliament had a right to suppose you would act. The Treaty-making power has hitherto been safe, because those who used it took care to have a knowledge of the public sentiment, and took care also that the country should be aware of the general aims which they were prosecuting, and the direction in which they marched. My hon. friend the Member for Chelsea <sup>1</sup> employed an excellent expression when he said it had been usual that all the general lines of negotiation should be known to the nation; and I believe you cannot show an important stipulation in a Treaty, or if you can it would be the very rarest exception, and one of comparatively insignificant weight, of which the general lines had not been known and familiar to the people, before the faith of the Crown was committed. Of all the cases quoted by the noble Lord opposite, and which have, no doubt, been collected by official care, there is not one that was secretly negotiated, and the negotiation carrying it to a point, placing it beyond the control of Parliament. The whole proceedings about the Ionian Islands—which he triumphantly cited—extended over many months; they were in the full knowledge of the country, and it was perfectly in the

<sup>1</sup> Sir Charles Dilke.

power of Parliament before the work was accomplished to interfere and arrest it if it pleased. The offer made by the Government was one in respect of which it was perfectly well known that it must depend upon the state of opinion in England. I now call upon hon. gentlemen to produce, if they can, one instance of a Treaty of great importance, involving large and remote responsibilities, certain, in given contingencies, to impose heavy sacrifices upon the people, entirely beyond the lines of ordinary precedent, and reversing, as I have shown, established and vital principles of policy, which has been negotiated in secret, ratified in secret, and produced to Parliament only when it had received the final seal.

Sir, I must add that it is almost ludicrous to examine our relative positions with regard to the Treaty of Berlin and with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. At this moment, if we had found, as we have not found, the Treaty of Berlin to be on the whole a bad Treaty, which it was our duty to defeat if we could, we find ourselves at liberty to make the attempt. We have not yet passed the day of ratification. This House of Parliament may declare itself in decisive terms against any Treaty before ratification. The intervention of a Parliamentary Chamber, by well-understood precedent, can stop the ratification of a Treaty. That is to say, the Government which chooses to stop the ratification of a Treaty, in consequence of such an intervention, is not liable to a charge of bad faith. I speak from precedent, and from recollections which I think are tolerably clear. I refer to the case which happened in the year 1841 or 1842—but I think the former year. The question, which was of very great difficulty and importance, and was, at that time, of very considerable soreness between the two countries, related to the right of search at sea for slaves. A Treaty had been framed between the Governments of England and France. After that Treaty had been concluded and signed, the French Chamber manifested a spirit of ungovernable hostility towards it, whether by vote or any other form I do not now recollect. The French Government refused to ratify the Treaty, and the British Government accepted the decision of the French Government, and admitted that, however the act was to be lamented, it was within the rights that that Government possessed. And so we stand now with regard to the Treaty of Berlin. There is nothing in which it stands, perhaps, precisely as we should have anticipated; but everything stands within a certain measurable limit of devia-

tion, so to call it, from what we might have anticipated, and from what we were bound to anticipate. And yet there it would be in our power to interfere. In the case of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, on the contrary, we have a new and strange disclosure, almost like a revelation from another world, on matters totally unheard of in English politics, totally unknown to the course of our precedents, and no means are allowed to us of intervention or rejection. The ratification is carefully effected several days before the existence of the Treaty is made known. We are not told that it was kept back in order that it might be placed beyond our reach ; but only that it was kept back lest the Sultan, if it were brought into the light of day, should refuse to sign it. Sir, the noble Lord who has last sat down <sup>1</sup> is totally incapable of mockery or of unkindly action of any sort. Were it not so, I should have been tempted to suppose that he was mocking us when he said—" You ought to have known quite enough about it, for hints of all kinds were cast about."

This to my mind, Sir, is a most serious matter. I think we have lost greatly by the conclusion of this Convention ; I think we have lost very greatly indeed the sympathy and respect of the nations of Europe. I do not expect or believe that we shall fall into that sort of contempt which follows upon weakness. I think it to be one of the most threadbare of all the weapons of Party warfare when we hear, as we sometimes hear, on the accession of a new Government, that before its accession the Government had been despised all over the world, and that now, on the contrary, she has risen in the general estimation, and holds her proper place in the Councils of Nations. This England of ours is not so poor and so weak a thing as to depend upon the reputation of this or that Administration ; and the world knows pretty well of what stuff she is made. I am not quite sure, however, that the world has the same clear and strong conviction with respect to the standard of our moral action as it has with respect to the standard of our material strength. Now, I am desirous that the standard of our material strength shall be highly and justly estimated by the other nations of Christendom ; but I believe it to be of still more vital consequence that we should stand high in their estimation as the lovers of truth, of honour, and of openness in all our proceedings, as those who know how to cast aside the motives of a narrow selfishness, and give scope to considerations of broad and lofty principle. I value our insular

<sup>1</sup> Viscount Sandon.

position, but I dread the day when we shall be reduced to a moral insularity. I desire that sympathy should be cherished with every country, be its name what it may ; and I fear that the conclusion of this Convention will be injurious to the action of that sympathy. The proceedings have all along been associated with a profession as to certain British interests, which, although I believe them to be perfectly fictitious and imaginary, have yet been pursued with as much zeal and eagerness, as if they had been the most vital realities in the world. This setting up of our own interests, out of place, in an exaggerated form, beyond their proper sphere, and not merely the setting up of such interests, but the mode in which they have been pursued has greatly diminished, not, as I have said, the regard for our material strength, but the estimation of our moral standard of action, and consequently our moral position in the world. If that be so, Sir, with respect to foreign countries, with respect to Parliament, I believe the case to be graver still.

I am reluctant to trespass further on the patience of the House. I have already the opinions, which I have now declared about the exercise of the Treaty-making power, I had not long ago an opportunity of expressing in the face of an important personage associated with Government. I must now add that I had the satisfaction of hearing commendation from that quarter given to the principles I have laid down, as to the manner in which the Treaty-making power ought to be exercised—that is to say, that it should be exercised with regard to the actual state of the convictions, and the knowledge, and the desires of the people, and not merely according to the idea that a particular Government might, however sincerely, conceive as to their interest. I am at a loss to reconcile those commendations.

I am afraid, Sir, that we have reached a state of things in which Her Majesty's Government have done great and needless harm to the rights and Prerogatives of Parliament. I do not even hesitate to say that although I believe the Treaty-making power has stood on firm foundations in this country down to the present year, and although it is most deplorable that anything should be said, or done, to bring it into question, yet such proceedings, as these most recent proceedings of the Administration, have a direct tendency to produce that effect, and, if persevered in, will undoubtedly end in raising controversies with respect to that power, which we should all of us be desirous to avoid.

I will not fail, so far as my powers carry me, in the duty of

protesting against that course. I grieve over that which has been done. I am obliged to recall words which I used some fifteen months ago in this House, with regard to the contingencies of the war which had then just broken out. I said that if the work of liberation was to be done, but was effected without the approval, nay, rather under the ban, of England, as a man I should rejoice, but as an Englishman I should hide my head. That is the result which has actually arrived; and now, even at the last moment, and even in the Congress at Berlin, after the war had been concluded, with final results favourable to the freedom and happiness of mankind, the action of the English Government has not been directed to the extension of the work of liberation; but, on the contrary, to its contraction. I had myself begun to cherish the expectation and the desire that these keen debates—for keen they could not but be—on the great Eastern Question, were about to reach or even had reached their close; but while we were indulging in these fond anticipations, Her Majesty's Government were preparing a new stroke for us, and we were startled with a novelty even greater than any that had gone before. It is also one in respect to which we have, I fear, as yet, no justification for assuming that it is the last. On the contrary, we are perplexed with the apprehension that as long as these proceedings continue to be sustained by a majority in this House, and as long as the country has had no opportunity of passing its final and conclusive judgment, they will be repeated and renewed, from time to time, as may seem good to the Ministers in power. More and more damage will thus be done both to the great name and honour of this country, and to the Prerogatives and rights of Parliament, bound up, as they are, with the liberties of the people. First, we have the setting up of British interests, not real but imaginary. Then, we have the prosecution of these supposed British interests, by means of strange and unheard-of schemes, such as never occurred even to the imagination of statesmen of other days. Then we have those strange and unheard-of schemes, prosecuted in a manner which appears, as I conceive, to indicate a very deficient regard to the authority of the law of Europe, and to that just respect which is due to all foreign Powers. Then we have, associated with this grievous lack, a disregard, a neglect—it may, perhaps, even be said, a contempt—for the rights of Parliament. Lastly, along with all this, we create a belief, a belief rather strengthened than weakened by the evident absence of any eagerness on the part of Her Majesty's Government to give

us financial information, that the result of those operations of the Government, so unsound in their foundation, so wild in their aims, is likely to be an increase of responsibility, with no addition, but rather with a diminution, of strength ; a loss of respect abroad ; a shock to constitutional instincts and practices at home ; and also an augmentation of the burdens which are borne with such exemplary patience by a too confiding people.

# THE MIDLOTHIAN CAMPAIGN ·

## OPENING SPEECH

NOVEMBER 25, 1879

When Gladstone was induced to contest the county of Midlothian, then represented by the Duke of Buccleugh's son, Lord Dalkeith, he was endeavouring to rouse public opinion against the foreign policy of Lord Beaconsfield. He held strongly that the Government of the day had shown a contempt for considerations of humanity, had disregarded its obligations towards the Christians of South-Eastern Europe, and had treated Afghanistan with violent injustice. In the first speech which he made in Midlothian, delivered at Edinburgh, he reviewed the recent history of foreign affairs, and enumerated the principles which in his opinion should regulate our dealings with foreign countries. He laid great stress upon the desirability of acting, wherever possible, with the concert of Europe, and upon the duty of respecting the rights of small Powers as well as great. In his eyes the might and majesty of the British Empire were a tremendous trust, which involved responsibilities in proportion to its magnitude. He believed that the British Government, if well and wisely directed, could do a great deal to promote the freedom and progress of the world. He was by nature an optimist, apt to be unduly sanguine in his estimate of the forces which move public opinion. But his faith in the ultimate triumph of good was a main source of his strength, and contributed in no slight degree to the power which he exercised over the minds of his fellow-countrymen. Although Gladstone was by political succession a Peelite, he had much of Palmerston's sympathy with struggling nationalities, and rising States. In his Midlothian campaign, as it came to be called, he discussed all the leading questions of foreign policy with abundant force and vigour. His first speech really contains the essence of his international creed, and is entitled on that account to a prominent place in any selection of his oratorical work.

MY Lords and Gentlemen,—All will feel who are present, and all who, being absent, give any heed to the proceedings of to-day will feel that this is not an ordinary occasion. It is not an ordinary occasion which brings you and me together—me as a candidate for your Parliamentary suffrages, and you, I will not say as solicited by me, for by me you have not been solicited—but you as the spontaneous and gracious offerers to me of a trust which I deem it a high duty under these circumstances to seek, and which I shall deem it the highest honour to receive. It is not an ordinary occasion, gentlemen, because, as we all know, the ordinary rule is that in county representation it is customary, though not invariably the rule—it is

customary to choose some one who, by residence, by property, by constant intercourse, is identified with the county that he is asked to represent. In these respects I come among you as a stranger. It is not the first time that such a combination has been known. On the contrary, it has been, I may say, not infrequent for important counties, and especially for metropolitan counties, to select those who, in that sense, are strangers to their immediate locality to be their candidates or to be their representatives in Parliament, but always with a special purpose in view, and that purpose has been the rendering of some emphatic testimony to some important public principle. It is not, gentlemen, for the purpose of gratuitously disturbing your county that I am come among you, for before I could think it my duty to entertain the wishes so kindly pressed upon me, I used the very best exertions in my own power, and called in the very best and most experienced advice at my command, in order that I might be assured that I was not guilty of creating that wanton disturbance—in truth, that I was to come among you not as an intruder, not as a voluntary provoker of unnecessary strife, but as the person who, according to every reasonable principle of evidence, was designated by the desires of the decided majority of electors as their future representative.

Then, my lords and gentlemen, neither am I here, as I can truly and cheerfully say, for the purpose of any personal conflict. I will begin this campaign, if so it is to be called,—and a campaign, and an earnest campaign I trust it will be,—I will begin by avowing my personal respect for my noble opponent,<sup>1</sup> and for the distinguished family to which he belongs. Gentlemen, I have had the honour—for an honour I consider it—to sit as a colleague with the Duke of Buccleuch in the Cabinet of Sir Robert Peel. This is now nearly forty years ago. Since that time I frankly avow that I have changed various opinions ; I should say that I have learned various lessons. But I must say, and express it as my distinct and decided conviction, that that noble Duke, who was then my colleague under Sir Robert Peel, has changed like myself, but in an opposite direction and I believe that on this great occasion he is farther from his old position than I am. Let me, gentlemen, in the face of you who are Liberals, and determined Liberals, let me render this tribute to the memory of Sir Robert Peel. I never knew a more conscientious public man ; I never knew—in far the greater portion of questions that

<sup>1</sup> Lord Dalkeith.

concerned the public interest—a more enlightened statesman. And this opinion I give with confidence, in the face of the world, founded upon many years of intimate communication with him upon every subject of public interest ; that, could his valuable life have been called upon to take part, as we are now called upon to take part, in the great struggle which is commencing in this country, Sir Robert Peel would have been found contending along with you against the principles which now specially place you in determined opposition to the Government of the day. I render to the Duke of Buccleuch as freely as to Lord Dalkeith this tribute, that he—given and presupposed the misfortune of his false political opinions—is in all respects what a British nobleman ought to be, and sets to us all an example in the active and conscientious discharge of duty, such as he believes duty to be, which we shall do well, from our very different point of view, to follow.

And now I hope I have spoken intelligibly upon that subject, and I will pass on to another which is far less agreeable. I thought when the invitation of the electors of Midlothian was sent to me, that the matter in controversy was one of sufficient breadth and complication, and I then was not aware that it would become still more enhanced and still more entangled by a question which, in its first aspect, was local, but which, in its ulterior aspect, is of the deepest importance, embraces in its scope the whole country, and descends to the very roots of our institutions. I thought that in one thing at least my noble opponent and myself were agreed—that is to say, that we were agreed in making a common appeal to the true and legitimate electors of Midlothian. I am grieved to find that that is not to be the case ; that, mistrusting the body to whom the constitution and the law had given the power of choice between candidates for Midlothian, an attempt has been made to import into the county a body of strangers, having no natural interest in the county, gifted with colourable qualifications invented by the chicanery of law, and that it is on this body that reliance is placed, in order, perchance, to realize some faint hope of overbearing the true majority of the constituency. I won't dilate, gentlemen, upon that subject—I won't expatiate upon it,—but this I must say, that if anything was wanting to make me feel it more than ever a duty to endeavour to fight the battle with energy and determination, this most unfortunate act was the very thing destined for that purpose. Why, gentlemen, quite apart from every question of principle, nothing, I venture to say, can be so grossly imprudent as that which is

familiarly known in homely but most accurate phrase as the manufacture of faggot votes. Those who manufacture faggot votes provoke investigation into the whole state of the law, and of those provisions of the law which at the present moment are framed with such liberality towards the possessors of property.

Why, Sir, is it not enough that the man who happens to have property in six or ten counties can give a vote in respect of that property, in conformity with the rules of the Constitution, in every one of those counties? Is it not enough that he who, after all, has only the interests of a citizen in the well-being of the country, shall be permitted, by the free assent of all parties, without dishonour, without evasion, to multiply his own individual existence, and to contribute to the issue of six or ten electioneering contests, instead of one? Is not this enough? Is not this sufficiently liberal to the rich man as compared with the poor man, who hardly ever, though he may be a voter, can by possibility have more than a single vote? Ought not the Duke of Buccleuch and his friends to be satisfied with that state of law? Is it not the fact that in this country, although the law refuses to give a double vote in respect of a larger qualification, yet is it not the fact that it is the rarest thing in the world to meet a poor voter who has more than one vote, whereas it is the rarest thing in the world to meet a gentleman voter, as he is called, who has not got more than one vote? Why are they not content with that state of things? Why do they determine upon adding to that lawful multiplication of power, which, I must say, is based upon a remarkable liberality towards the possessors of property? why, in addition to that, are they determined to aim at an unlawful multiplication of power, and to bring in upon you, the genuine voters of Midlothian, those guests, those foreigners—for foreigners they are—foreigners they are in respect of the concerns of this county—its political concerns—for the purpose of overbearing the genuine and true sense of the constituency? Gentlemen, my anticipation is that this extraordinary manœuvre will utterly, certainly, and miserably fail of its purpose. I have not been surprised to be assured by those among you who have interested themselves specially in the affairs of the coming election, that we stand quite as well as we did, or better than we did, before the introduction of these faggot votes. We are divided into parties in this country, and the division is a healthy one. But there is always, at the same time, a certain margin of gentlemen who will have regard to other than party considerations, where

they think that some great public principle is at stake ; and my belief is that there will be, and must be, many in Midlothian who will not consent to compromise a principle more sacred and more important than any of the ordinary differences of party, namely this, that the representative of each county shall be chosen by the county itself, and shall not be chosen by importations of gentlemen from abroad, brought in to overbear its true and native sense.

Well, gentlemen, I pass on from that subject, which you are very capable of handling, and which, I daresay, you will find a good deal to say upon before we have brought this business to a conclusion—I pass on to other matters, and I wish to say a word upon the subject—having thus far spoken of my own personal appearance and its grounds—upon the subject of the time at which I appear before you. Why do I come here to trouble you at this time ? Are we going to have a dissolution ? There is a question of great interest. I won't pretend, gentlemen, to answer it. My belief is that there has been a good deal of consultation in high quarters upon that subject ; and observe the reason why there should be, and why there must have been consultation. The reason is plain. It is this : we have arrived at the time wherein, according to the fixed and invariable practice, I think, of the entire century, nay, even of more than the entire century, there ought to be a dissolution. The rule, and the wise rule, of our governors in other times has been, that although the law allows a duration of seven years to Parliament, it should not sit to transact more than the regular business of six sessions. And you will see, gentlemen, the good sense, I think, of such a rule. It appears to be founded upon this, that the operations of the seventh session would be likely to descend as to their moral level below the standard of the earlier portions of a Parliament ; that the interests of the country would be more liable to be compromised by personal inducements, and personal inducements not in relation to the country at large, but in relation to particular groups and cliques of persons—in relation to what are sometimes called harassed interests. And matters of that kind would be likely to bring about a bartering and trafficking in public interests for personal ends if it were made absolutely certain that in so many weeks, or in two or three months, the Parliament must be dissolved. Now, out of this has grown a rule ; I am far from saying that rule is a rule mathematical or inflexible ; for some great public or national reason it is perfectly justifiable to depart from

it—but what is the public or national reason for departing from it now? None at all. I defy the most ingenious man to suggest to me any reason whatever for departing from this rule, which has been in use through the whole of our lifetime—I believe even through the lifetime of your fathers and grandfathers. I don't believe the wit of man can give a reason for departing from it except this, that it is thought to be upon the whole for the interests of Her Majesty's Government. That, I say at once, is not a legitimate reason for departing from the constitutional rule. They have no right to take into view the interests of the Government in respect to a question whether a Parliament shall be prolonged beyond the period fixed by long and unbroken usage. They are bound to decide that question upon national and imperial considerations, and if no national or imperial consideration dictates a departure from the rule, they are bound to adhere to the rule. Well, now we are told they mean to break the rule. I can't say I shall be surprised at their breaking the rule of usage, for this Government, which delights in the title of Conservative, or rather which was not satisfied with the title of Conservative, but has always fallen back upon the title of Tory—this Tory Government, from which we have the right to expect—I would almost say to exact—an extraordinary reverence for everything that was fixed—reverence which has been paid in many instances whether it is good or bad—yet this Tory Government has undoubtedly created a greater number of innovations, broken away from a greater number of precedents, set a greater number of new-fangled examples to mislead and bewilder future generations, than any Government which has existed in my time. Therefore I am not at all surprised that they should have broken away from a rule of this kind so far as regards the respect due to an established and, on the whole, a reasonable and a useful custom; but at the same time they would not break away without some reason—an illegitimate reason, because one connected with their interests; a strange reason, because one would have thought that a Government whose proceedings, as will be admitted on all hands, have been of so marked a character ought to have been anxious at the earliest period permitted by usage to obtain the judgment of the country.

And why, gentlemen, are they not anxious to obtain the judgment of the country? It is surely plain that they are not anxious. If they were anxious, they would follow the rule, and dissolve the Parliament. It is plain, therefore, that they are not

anxious. Why are they not anxious? Have they not told us all along that they possess the confidence of the people? Have they not boasted right and left that vast majorities of the nation are in the same sense with themselves? Oh, gentlemen, these are idle pretexts! It is an instinct lying far deeper than those professions that teaches them that the country is against them. And it is because they know that the country is against them that they are unwilling to appeal to the country. Why, gentlemen, a dissolution, an appeal to the public judgment when there is a knowledge beforehand on the part of those who make the appeal that the answer will be favourable, gives additional strength to those who make the appeal. If it be true, as they still say, that the country is in their favour, I say that after the favourable reply that they would receive to their appeal, they would come back to Parliament far stronger for the purpose of giving effect to the principles that they hold to be true, than they are at this moment. They know perfectly well that a favourable appeal would strengthen their hands; they know perfectly well that an unfavourable answer will be the end of their ministerial existence; and it therefore requires no great wit on our part to judge why, when they have reached the usual, and what I may almost call constitutional period, they don't choose to make an appeal at all.

There are some reasons, gentlemen, why they ought to make that appeal which bear on their own party interests. They will not have a very pleasant operation to perform when they produce their next Budget. I am not going to enter into that subject now. You must excuse me if I do not attempt on this occasion to cover the whole of the enormously wide field that is open before me; but I promise, especially as the Chancellor of the Exchequer <sup>1</sup> says it is most agreeable to him that the question of finance should be discussed, and, in fact, he has chosen the most extraordinary opportunity, for the first time that I can recollect, for discussing it—namely, at the Lord Mayor's dinner—but as he is so desirous it should be discussed, I, having every disposition to comply with his wishes as far as I can, will certainly endeavour to enter into that matter, and set out the main facts of the case as well as I am able. I do not think there is a great anxiety to produce that Budget; and this of itself would recommend a dissolution.

I tell you, gentlemen, what I think, and that is what has led me to dwell at length on the subject of dissolution. It is because it is not a theoretical, but a practical consideration. It is this:

<sup>1</sup> Sir Stafford Northcote.

we are told by "whippers-in," and gentlemen probably have an inspiration that sometimes flows from the higher quarters into those peculiar and favoured channels—we are told that they think there will not be a dissolution for twelve months. Twelve months, gentlemen! There is what is called a "chapter of accidents," and by postponing the dissolution for twelve months you get your twelve months of the exercise of power. Now, I am not going to impute to this Government, or any Government, sordid motives for the desire to retain power. In my opinion, imputations of that kind, which are incessantly made upon me, and incessantly made upon the Liberal party generally, and especially upon the leaders of the Liberal party—in my opinion, imputations of that kind are disgraceful only to those who make them.

I pass on. The love of power is something much higher. It is the love, of course, of doing what they think good by means of power. Twelve months would be secured in that sense—something more would be secured. There would be the chance of striking some new theatrical stroke. There would be the chance of sending up some new rocket into the sky—the chance of taking some measure which again would carry misgiving and dismay to the hearts of the sober-minded portion of the nation—as I believe, at this time the great majority of the nation—but which, appealing to pride and passion, would always in this, as in every country, find some loud-voiced minority ready to echo back its ill-omened sounds, and again to disturb the world, to destroy confidence, to unsettle business and the employments of life, to hold out false promises of greatness, but really to alienate from this country the sympathies of the civilized world, and to prepare for us the day of misfortune and of dishonour.

Now, gentlemen, I am not saying that which is peculiar to persons of my political creed. It was only upon the 10th of November that the Prime Minister <sup>1</sup> gave to the world the assurance that he thought peace might be maintained. I thought that matter had been settled eighteen months ago, when he came back from Berlin and said he had got "peace with honour." Now he says, "I think peace may be maintained, and I think it is much more likely now than it was twelve months ago"—more likely than it was five months or four months after he had come back from Berlin and announced "peace with honour." That is what he says—he thinks it may be maintained. But on the very

<sup>1</sup> Lord Beaconsfield.

next morning, I read what I consider by far the cleverest of all the journals that have been used to support the foreign policy of the Ministry in the metropolis, viz. the *Pall Mall Gazette*. In it I read a passage to this effect : " We have before us ample evidence, in the tone of the foreign press, of the alarm which is felt upon the Continent at the supposed projects of the English Government." Rely upon it, gentlemen, there are more of these projects in the air. For the last two years their whole existence has been a succession of these projects. As long as Lord Derby and Lord Carnarvon were among them there was an important obstacle placed in their way in the character of these men. But since that time we have had nothing but new projects, one more alarming and more dangerous than another.

They began with sending their fleet to the Dardanelles without the consent of the Sultan, and in violation of the Treaty of Paris, which gave them no right to send it. After that they went on by bringing their Indian troops into Europe against the law of the country. After that they proceeded to make their Anglo-Turkish Convention, without the knowledge of Europe, when for six months they had been contending, I may say, at the point of the sword, that it was Europe, and Europe alone, that had a right to manage the concerns of the Turkish Empire. It is difficult, gentlemen, human memory will hardly avail, to bring up all these cases. I have got now as far as the Anglo-Turkish Convention. What is the next ? The next is Afghanistan. A war was made in Afghanistan to the surprise and astonishment—I might almost say to the horror—of this country, upon which I shall have occasion, either to-day or on another day, to enlarge more than I can do at the present moment. I am now only illustrating to you the manner in which a series of surprises, a series of theatrical expedients, calculated to excite, calculated to alarm, calculated to stir pride and passion, and calculated to divide the world, have been the daily employment and subsistence, the established dietary of the present Government. Afghanistan, gentlemen, was not the last. Having had a diversion of that kind in Asia, the next turn was to be in Africa. But there a different course was adopted. The practice which in other circles is well known by the name of " hedging " was brought into play, and Sir Bartle Frere was exhorted and instructed as to affairs in Africa with infinite skill, and in terms most accurately constructed in such a way that if they turned out well, the honour and the glory would redound to this patriotic Government ; but if they turned out ill,

the responsibility and the burden would fall on the shoulders of Sir Bartle Frere.

Well, these came one after another, gentlemen, and now we have not done ; we end where we began, and again it is a question of sending the fleet to the Dardanelles. Whether it is on its way there we do not know at this moment. We know that the officers—at least that is the last account I have seen—that the officers are only allowed to be within call at two hours' notice. When the catalogue of expedients is exhausted, it is just like a manager with his stock of theatrical pieces—after he has presented them all he must begin again—and so we are again excited, and I must say alarmed, and I believe that Europe is greatly disquieted and disturbed, by not knowing what is to be the next quasi-military operation of the Government.

These are not subjects, gentlemen, upon which I will dilate at the present moment, but this I will say, that in my opinion, and in the opinion which I have derived from the great statesmen of the period of my youth, without any distinction of party, but, if there was any distinction of party, which I have learned more from Conservative statesmen than from Liberal statesmen, the great duty of a Government, especially in foreign affairs, is to soothe and tranquillize the minds of the people, not to set up false phantoms of glory which are to delude them into calamity, not to flatter their infirmities by leading them to believe that they are better than the rest of the world, and so to encourage the baleful spirit of domination ; but to proceed upon a principle that recognizes the sisterhood and equality of nations, the absolute equality of public right among them ; above all, to endeavour to produce and to maintain a temper so calm and so deliberate in the public opinion of the country, that none shall be able to disturb it. The maxim of a Government ought, gentlemen, to be that which was known in ancient history as the appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. But the conduct of the present Government, and their resort one after another to these needless, alarming, and too frequently most discreditable measures, has been exactly the reverse. Their business has been to appeal to pride and passion, to stir up those very feelings which every wise man ought to endeavour to allay, and, in fact, constantly to appeal from Philip sober to Philip drunk.

Gentlemen, I have come into this country to repeat, with your permission, the indictment which I have to the best of my ability endeavoured to make many times elsewhere against Her Majesty's

Government. It is a very serious indictment. It is well in these things that men should be held to the words that they utter, should be made to feel that they are responsible for them, and therefore you will perhaps allow me to read a sentence, which I embodied in the letter written in reply to your most flattering and most obliging invitation. My sentence was this : " The management of finance, the scale of expenditure, the constantly growing arrears of legislation, serious as they are, only lead up to still greater questions. I hold before you, as I have held in the House of Commons, that the faith and honour of the country have been gravely compromised in the foreign policy of the Ministry ; that by the disturbance of confidence, and lately even of peace, which they have brought about, they have prolonged and aggravated the public distress ; that they have augmented the power and influence of the Russian Empire, even while estranging the feelings of its population ; that they have embarked the Crown and people in an unjust war,<sup>1</sup> full of mischief if not of positive danger to India ; and that by their use of the treaty-making and war-making powers of the Crown they have abridged the just rights of Parliament and have presented prerogative to the nation under an unconstitutional aspect which tends to make it insecure." Not from one phrase, not from one syllable of that indictment do I recede. If, gentlemen, in addressing this constituency there be any part of it upon which at the close I shall not seem to have made good the original statement, most glad shall I be to attend to the legitimate appeal of those who may think fit to challenge me upon the point, and to bring forward the matter—alas ! only too abundant—by which every one of them can be substantiated before the world. Those, certainly, gentlemen, are charges of the utmost gravity.

But we are met with preliminary objections, and we are told, we are incessantly told, that there is no fault in the Government, that this is all a spirit of faction on the part of the Liberal party. I need not quote what you know very well ; that this is the stock and standing material of invective against us—it is all our faction. The Government is perfectly innocent, but we are determined to blacken them because of the selfish and unjust motives by which we are prompted. Now that charge, standing as it usually does stand, in the stead of argument upon the acts of the Government themselves, and being found far more convenient by our opponents than the justification of those acts upon the merits, I wish

<sup>1</sup> Afghan War.

to try that charge. I will not try it by retorting imputations of evil motive. I have already said what I think of them. And to no man will I, for one, impute a want of patriotism in his public policy. It is a charge continually made against us. So far as I am concerned, it never shall be made against our opponents. But I am going to examine very shortly this charge of a spirit of faction on the part of the Liberal party. I do not condescend to deal with it by a mere counter-assertion, by a mere statement that we are innocent of it, nor will I endeavour to excite you—as probably a Tory speaker would excite you—as a thousand Tory speakers have excited their hearers, by drawing forth their uninformed cheers through assertions of that kind. But I will come to facts, and I will ask whether the facts of the case bear out, or whether they do not absolutely confute that assertion.

Now, the great question of dispute between the two parties and the question out of which every other question has grown collaterally, has been what is known as the Eastern Question.

And what I want to point out to you is this—the date at which the Eastern Question, and the action of the Government upon the Eastern Question, began, and the date at which the action of the Liberal party, as a party, upon the Eastern Question began. The Eastern Question began, that is, its recent phase and development began, in the summer of 1875, and it immediately assumed great importance. In the winter of 1875 the Powers of Europe endeavoured to arrange for concerted action on the Eastern Question by what was called the Andrassy Note.

They had first endeavoured to arrange for concerted action by their consuls. The British Government stated that they objected on principle to any interference between the Sultan and his subjects. Nevertheless, they were willing to allow their consuls to act, provided it were done in such a way that no interference should be contemplated. Of course this failed. Then came the Andrassy Note. The Government objected on principle to the Andrassy Note, but they finally agreed to it, because the Turk wished them to agree to it—that is to say, that the Turk, who has very considerable astuteness, saw that he had better have in the councils of Europe some Power on which he could rely to prevent these councils from coming to practical effect, rather than to leave the Continental Powers of Europe to act alone.

In the spring of 1876, the Andrassy Note having been frustrated of its effect, not owing to the Government, who finally concurred in it, but owing to circumstances in Turkey, the Powers

of Europe again endeavoured more seriously to arrange for concerted action, and produced what they called the Berlin Memorandum. The British Government absolutely and flatly refused to support the Berlin Memorandum. We have now arrived, gentlemen, at the end of the session of 1876. Now, mind, the charge is that the Liberal party has been cavilling at the foreign policy of the Government in the East from a spirit of faction. What I point out to you is this—that down to the end of the session 1876, although the Government had been adopting measures of the utmost importance in direct contradiction to the spirit and action of the rest of the Powers of Europe, there was not one word of hostile comment from the Liberal party.

On the 31st July, 1876, at the very end of the session, there was a debate in the House of Commons. In that debate I took part. I did censure the conduct of the Government in refusing the Berlin Memorandum without suggesting some alternative to maintain the concert of Europe, and Lord Beaconsfield—I am now going to show you the evidence upon which I speak—Lord Beaconsfield, in reply to me on the debate, said that the right honourable gentleman, meaning myself, was the only person who had assailed the policy of the Government. Now I ask you, was it faction in the Liberal party to remain silent during all these important acts, and to extend their confidence to the Government in the affairs of the Turkish Empire, even when that Government was acting in contradiction to the whole spirit, I must say, of civilized mankind—certainly in contradiction to the united proposals of the five Great Powers of the continent of Europe?

Far more difficult is it to justify the Liberal party upon the other side. Why did we allow the East to be thrown into confusion? Why did we allow the concert of Europe to be broken up? Why did we allow the Berlin Memorandum to be thrown behind the fire, and no other measure substituted in its place? Why did we allow that fatal progression of events to advance unchecked by us, so far, even after the fields of Bulgaria had flowed with blood, and the cry of every horror known and unknown had ascended to heaven from that country? Why did we remain silent for such a length of time? Gentlemen, that is not all.

It is quite true that there was, soon after, a refusal of the great human heart of this country, not in Parliament, but outside of Parliament, to acquiesce in what was going on, and to maintain the ignominious silence which we had maintained on the subject of the Bulgarian massacres.

In August and September 1876 there was an outburst, an involuntary outburst, for the strain could no longer be borne from the people of this country, in every quarter of the country, denouncing those massacres. But that, gentlemen, was not by the action of the Liberal party. It was admitted by the Government themselves to be the expression of the country—misled, as they said, but still the expression of the country. It is true that it was said with reference to me that any man who made use of the susceptibilities of the country for the purpose of bringing himself back to office was worse than those who had perpetrated the Bulgarian massacres. But that was only a remark which hit one insignificant individual, nor was he very deeply wounded by it. But the Liberal party was not, as a party, in the field. Nay, more ; that national feeling produced its effects. It produced the Conference at Constantinople. That was eighteen months after the Eastern Question had been opened. Down to the date of that Conference, the Liberal party had taken no step for any purpose prejudicial to the action of the Government ; and when Lord Salisbury went to the Conference at Constantinople, he went, I say it without fear of contradiction, carrying with him the goodwill, carrying with him the favourable auspices, carrying with him, I will even say, the confidence of the Liberal party as to the result and the tendency of his exertions. And it was not till after nearly two years—viz., late in the spring, or during the spring of 1877—it was not until nearly two years after the Government had been busy with the Eastern Question that the Liberal party first began somewhat feebly to raise its voice in the House of Commons, and to protest against the course that had been adopted, which was evidently, as we thought, a course tending to bring about war, bloodshed, and disturbance, that might very easily have been avoided.

Now, gentlemen, I think I have shown you that it requires some audacity to charge with faction in this matter a party which maintained such a silence for nearly two years ; which was even willing to acquiesce in the rejection of the Berlin Memorandum, and which heartily accompanied with its goodwill and confidence Lord Salisbury when he went to the Conference at Constantinople. I do not hesitate to say this, gentlemen, that when Lord Salisbury went to Constantinople—I believe with a perfectly upright and honourable intention—he carried with him a great deal more confidence from the Liberal party than he carried with him from some among his own colleagues.

But now, gentlemen, I can only say that if the Liberal party are governed by a factious spirit, they are great fools for their pains. What means a factious spirit but the action of an ungovernable desire to get into office? And it is alleged that the Liberal party are under the influence of such a desire. Well, gentlemen, if they are, all I can say is that there is no disputing about tastes; but men must be men of a very extraordinary taste who desire to take such a succession as will be left by the present Government.

I hope the verdict of the country will give to Lord Granville and Lord Hartington the responsible charge of its affairs.

But I must say I think them much to be pitied on the day when that charge is committed to their hands. Never, gentlemen, never in the recollection of living man has such an entangled web been given over to any set of men to unravel. Did they receive a similar inheritance from us when we went out of power? Did we give over to them that which will be given over by them to their successors? Gentlemen, I make no boast. We simply gave over to them what every Government has usually given over to its successors. Let us do them justice. Do not let us allow party feelings to lead us to suppose that there never has been prudence and discretion and right principle on the part of a Conservative Government, at least so far as to make sure that any evils for which they were responsible would be tolerable evils, and would not greatly disturb the general stability of the country. We did, merely to the best of our ability, what others had done before us.

But still, when we shall have so largely to consider the state of things to which the action of the present Government has brought the affairs of this country, it is absolutely necessary that I should briefly recall to your minds the nature of the starting-point from which they set out. What was their starting-place, gentlemen, in finance? The starting-point in finance was this, that we handed over to them a surplus which, in our hands, I will venture to say, would have been a surplus closely approaching six millions of money. Now, I have spoken of the manner in which they carry on this warfare, and you will believe that their scribes, with a pertinacious activity, feeling the difficulties of their case, have been very, very hard driven to know how to deal with this question of the surplus. It has been necessary for them to get rid of it in some way or other, and some of them have actually had the cool audacity to say—I have read it in various

newspapers ; I have read it in a Sheffield newspaper, which, however, I won't name ; it would not be delicate in reference to the feelings of the high-minded gentleman who wrote it—but they have asserted that we left to them £3,000,000 of Alabama payment, which we ought to have made, but which we handed over to them to pay. The only objection to this is that, if you consult the accounts, you will find that that £3,000,000 was paid by us in the year before we left office.

Then it is said this surplus was not a “ realized surplus.” What is meant by a realized surplus ? According to them, there never had been such a thing in this country as a realized surplus. The law of this country provides, and most wisely provides, that when for the current year there is a certain surplus of revenue over expenditure, the money shall, in fixed proportions, be then and there applied to the reduction of debt. That, of course, was done in the last year of our Government. But what we left was the prospect of the incoming revenue for the following year. That was the prospect, which distinctly showed that there would be a surplus of £5,000,000 to £6,000,000, and that was the prospect we handed over to them ; and if they choose to say it was not a realized surplus—undoubtedly it was no more realized than the Duke of Buccleuch's rents for next year are realized ; but if, as is not likely, the Duke of Buccleuch has occasion to borrow on the security of his rents for next year, I suspect he will find many people quite ready to lend to him. Well, gentlemen, that is the only explanation I need give you. But I do assure you that such has been the amount of Tory assertion on this subject of the surplus, that I have been pestered for the last two or three years of my life with letters from puzzled Liberals, who wrote to say they had believed there was a surplus of £5,000,000 or £6,000,000, but the Tories would not admit it, and they begged me, for their own individual enlightenment, to explain to them how it was. Our surplus was like every other real and bona fide surplus, which the law of this country contemplates or permits, and the effect of it was that the Tories, who have since done nothing but add to the burdens of the people, were able to commence their career with a large remission of taxation. That was the case with finance.

How did we leave the army ? because one of the favourite assertions of their scribes is that we ruined the army. Well, gentlemen, undoubtedly we put the country to very heavy expense on account of the army ; but we put them to heavy expense

for objects which we thought important. We found that the army, through the system of purchase, was the property of the rich. We abolished purchase, and we tried to make it, and in some degree, I hope, have made it, the property of the nation. But we have been told that we weakened and reduced the army. Weakened and reduced the army ! Why, we for the first time founded a real military reserve—that reserve under which, in 1878, there happened an event previously quite unknown to our history—namely, that upon the stroke of a pen sent forth by the Minister to the country, almost in a day five-and-thirty thousand trained men were added to the ranks of the army. That was the result of the system of reserve ; and the system of reserve, along with many other great and valuable reforms, the country owes to Lord Cardwell, the Secretary of War under the late Government.

Well, gentlemen, you know—I need not enter into details—what was the general state of our foreign relations. The topic of our foreign relations can be disposed of in one minute. It is constantly said, indeed, by the scribes of the Government, and it was intimated by Lord Salisbury,—to whom I will return in greater detail at a future time,—that the foreign policy of the late Government was discreditable. Well, but here I have got a witness on the other side. I have got the witness of Lord Beaconsfield's Foreign Secretary at the time when he took office. At the time when he took office in the House of Lords, Lord Derby, then enjoying the full undivided confidence of the Conservative party, used these words on the 19th March, 1874 : “ At the present moment the condition of the country in regard to our foreign relations is most satisfactory. There is no State whatever with which our relations are not most cordial.” Now, our unfortunate friends and fellow-citizens, the Tories, are constantly called upon to believe that at the time they took office the state of the country, in regard to foreign relations, was most unsatisfactory, and that with no State were our relations most cordial, because by every State we were undervalued and despised. Gentlemen, there was not a cloud upon the horizon at the time when the charge of foreign affairs was handed over to Her Majesty's present Government. Does that imply that there was nothing serious to be done ? Oh no, gentlemen, depend upon it, and you will find it to your cost before you are five years older, you will know it better than you do to-day ; depend upon it that this Empire is an Empire, the daily calls of whose immense responsibilities, the daily inevitable

calls of whose responsibilities, task and overtask the energies of the best and ablest of her sons. Why, gentlemen, there is not a country in the history of the world that has undertaken what we have undertaken ; and when I say " what we have undertaken," I don't mean what the present Government have undertaken—that I will come to by and by—but what England in its traditional established policy and position has undertaken.

There is no precedent in human history for a formation like the British Empire. A small island at one extremity of the globe peoples the whole earth with its colonies. Not satisfied with that, it goes among the ancient races of Asia and subjects two hundred and forty millions of men to its rule. Along with all this it disseminates over the world a commerce such as no imagination ever conceived in former times, and such as no poet ever painted. And all this has to do with the strength that lies within the narrow limits of these shores. Not a strength that I disparage ; on the contrary, I wish to dissipate, if I can, the idle dreams of those who are always telling you that the strength of England depends, sometimes they say upon its prestige, sometimes they say upon its extending its Empire, or upon what it possesses beyond these shores. Rely upon it the strength of Great Britain and Ireland is within the United Kingdom. Whatever is to be done in defending and governing these vast colonies with their teeming millions ; in protecting that unmeasured commerce ; in relation to the enormous responsibilities of India—whatever is to be done, must be done by the force derived from you and from your children, derived from you and from your fellow-electors, throughout the land, and from you and from the citizens and people of this country. And who are they ? They are, perhaps, some three-and-thirty millions of persons,—a population less than the population of France ; less than the population of Austria ; less than the population of Germany ; and much less than the population of Russia. But the populations of Austria, of Russia, of Germany, and of France find it quite hard enough to settle their own matters within their own limits. We have undertaken to settle the affairs of about a fourth of the entire human race scattered over all the world. Is not that enough for the ambition of Lord Beaconsfield ? It satisfied the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Canning, Lord Grey and Sir Robert Peel ; it satisfied Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell, ay, and the late Lord Derby. And why cannot it satisfy—I do not want to draw any invidious distinction between Lord Beaconsfield and his

colleagues ; it seems to me that they are all now very much of one mind, that they all move with harmony amongst themselves ; but I say, why is it not to satisfy the ambition of the members of the present Government ? I affirm that, on the contrary, strive and labour as you will in office—I speak after the experience of a life-time, of which a fair portion has been spent in office—I say that strive and labour as you will in Parliament and in office, human strength and human thought are not equal to the ordinary discharge of the calls and duties appertaining to Government in this great, wonderful and world-wide Empire. And therefore, gentlemen, I say it is indeed deplorable that in addition to these calls, of which we have evidence in a thousand forms, and of our insufficiency to meet which we have evidence in a thousand forms—when, in addition to these calls, all manner of gratuitous, dangerous, ambiguous, impracticable, and impossible engagements are contracted for us in all parts of the world.

And that is what has lately been happening. I am not now going to discuss this question upon the highest grounds. I assail the policy of the Government on the highest grounds of principle. But I am now for a few moments only about to test it on the grounds of prudence. I appeal to you as practical men, I appeal to you as agriculturists, I appeal to you as tradesmen—I appeal to you in whatever class or profession you may be, and ask whether it is not wise to have some regard to the relation between means and ends, some regard to the relation between the work to be done and the strength you possess in order to perform it. I point to the state of our legislation, our accumulated and accumulating arrears constantly growing upon us ; I point to the multitude of unsolved problems of our Government, to the multitude of unsolved problems connected with the administration of our Indian Empire—enough, God knows, to call forth the deepest and most anxious reflection of the most sober-minded ; and even the most sanguine man, I say, might be satisfied with those tasks.

But what has been the course of things for the last three years ? I will run them over almost in as many words. We have got an annexation of territory—I put it down merely that I might not be incomplete—an annexation of territory in the Fiji Islands, of which I won't speak, because I don't consider the Government is censurable for that act, whether it were a wise act or not. Nobody could say that that was their spontaneous act. But now let us look at what have been their spontaneous acts. They have annexed in Africa the Transvaal territory, inhabited by a

free European, Christian, republican community, which they have thought proper to bring within the limits of a monarchy, although out of 8,000 persons in that republic qualified to vote upon the subject, we are told, and I have never seen the statement officially contradicted, that 6,500 protested against it. These are the circumstances under which we undertake to transform republicans into subjects of a monarchy. We have made war upon the Zulus. We have thereby become responsible for their territory ; and not only this, but we are now, as it appears from the latest advices, about to make war upon a chief lying to the northward of the Zulus ; and Sir Bartle Frere, who was the great authority for the proceedings of the Government in Afghanistan, has announced in South Africa that it will be necessary for us to extend our dominions until we reach the Portuguese frontier to the north. So much for Africa.

I come to Europe. In Europe we have annexed the island of Cyprus, of which I will say more at another time. We have assumed jointly with France the virtual government of Egypt ; and possibly, as we are to extend, says Sir Bartle Frere, our southern dominions in Africa till we meet the southern frontier of the Portuguese—possibly one of these days we may extend our northern dominions in Africa till we meet the northern frontier of the Portuguese. We then, gentlemen, have undertaken to make ourselves responsible for the good government of Turkey in Asia—not of Asia Minor, as you are sometimes told exclusively, but of the whole of that great space upon the map, including the principal part of Arabia, which is known geographically as Turkey in Asia. Besides governing it well, we have undertaken to defend the Armenian frontier of Turkey against Russia, a country which we cannot possibly get at except either by travelling over several hundreds of miles by land, including mountain-chains never adapted to be traversed by armies, or else some thousands of miles of sea, ending at the extremity of the Black Sea, and then, having to effect a landing. That is another of our engagements.

Well, and as if all that were not enough, we have by the most wanton invasion of Afghanistan, broken that country into pieces, made it a miserable ruin, destroyed whatever there was in it of peace and order, caused it to be added to the anarchies of the Eastern world, and we have become responsible for the management of the millions of warlike but very partially civilized people whom it contains, under circumstances where the application of

military power, and we have nothing but military power to go by, is attended at every foot with enormous difficulties.

Now, gentlemen, these are proceedings which I present to you at the present moment in the view of political prudence only. I really have but one great anxiety. This is a self-governing country. Let us bring home to the minds of the people the state of the facts they have to deal with, and in Heaven's name let them determine whether or not this is the way in which they like to be governed. Do not let us suppose this is like the old question between Whig and Tory. It is nothing of the kind. It is not now as if we were disputing about some secondary matter—it is not even as if we were disputing about the Irish Church, which no doubt was a very important affair. What we are disputing about is a whole system of Government, and to make good that proposition that it is a whole system of Government will be my great object in any addresses that I may deliver in this country. If it is acceptable, if it is liked by the people—they are the masters—it is for them to have it. It is not particularly pleasant for any man, I suppose, to spend the closing years of his life in vain and unavailing protest; but as long as he thinks his protest may avail, as long as he feels that the people have not yet had their fair chance and opportunity, it is his duty to protest, and it is to perform that duty, gentlemen, that I come here.

I have spoken, gentlemen, of the inheritance given over to the present Government by their predecessors, and of the inheritance that they will give over to those who succeed them. Now, our condition is not only, in my judgment, a condition of embarrassment, but it is one of embarrassment we have made for ourselves; and before I close, although I have already detained you too long, I must give a single illustration of the manner in which we have been making our own embarrassments. Why did we quarrel with the present Government about Turkey? I have shown that we were extremely slow in doing it. I believe we were too slow, and that, perhaps, if we had begun sooner our exertions might have availed more; but it was from a good motive. Why did we quarrel? What was the point upon which we quarrelled?

The point upon which we quarrelled was this: Whether coercion was under any circumstances to be applied to Turkey to bring about the better government of that country. Now that will not be disputed, or if it is disputed, and in order that it may not be disputed, for it is very difficult to say what won't be disputed—in order that it may not be disputed I will read from two

conclusive authorities. That is my point. The foundation of the policy of the present Government was that coercion was not to be applied to Turkey. Here is what Lord Cranbrook, who stated the case of the Government in the House of Commons, said: "We have proclaimed, and I proclaim again, in the strongest language, that we should be wrong in every sense of the word if we were to endeavour to apply material coercion against Turkey"; that was what Lord Cranbrook said on the 15th February, 1877; nor had he repented in April, for in April he said—

"Above all, we feel that we, who have engaged ourselves by treaty, at least in former times, who have had no personal wrong done to us, have no right and no commission, either as a country, or, as I may say, from Heaven, to take upon ourselves the vindication by violence of the rights of the Christian subjects of the Porte, however much we may feel for them."

Higher authority, of course, still than Lord Cranbrook, but in perfect conformity with him, was Lord Beaconsfield himself, who, on the 20th February, 1877, after a speech of Lord Granville's said this—

"The noble Lord and his friends are of opinion that we should have coerced the Porte into the acceptance of the policy which we recommended. That is not a course which we can conscientiously profess or promote, and I think, therefore, when an issue so broad is brought before the House, it really is the duty of noble Lords to give us an opportunity to clear the mind of the country by letting it know what is the opinion of Parliament upon policies so distinct, and which in their consequences must be so different."

Now, you see plainly that coercion in the extreme case that had arisen was recommended by the Liberal party. Coercion was objected to on the highest grounds by the Tory party; and Lord Beaconsfield virtually said, "Such is the profound difference between these policies that I challenge you to make a motion in Parliament, and to take the opinion of Parliament in order that we may know which way we are to move." That was not all, for after the English Government had disclaimed coercion, and after that terribly calamitous Russo-Turkish war had been begun and ended, Lord Beaconsfield declared that if the Government had been entirely consistent, they would not have rested satisfied with protesting against the action of Russia, so sacred was this principle of non-coercion in their eyes, but that they ought to have warned Russia that if she acted she must be prepared to encounter the opposition of England. I will read a very short passage from a letter of Sir Henry Layard which refers to

that declaration. Sir Henry Layard, on the 18th April, 1879, wrote or spoke as follows, I am not quite sure which ; I quote it from an unexceptionable authority, the *Daily Telegraph* of April 19 : " I agree with the remark of Lord Beaconsfield when he returned from the Berlin Congress, that if England had shown firmness in the first instance the late war might have been avoided. That is my conviction, and everything I have seen tends to confirm it." If England had shown firmness—that is to say, if she had threatened Russia. There is no other meaning applicable to the words. I have shown you, therefore, gentlemen, what it is upon which we went to issue—whether Turkey should be coerced, or whether she should not.

But there is an important limitation. We had never given countenance to single-handed attempts to coerce Turkey. We feel that single-handed attempts to coerce Turkey would probably lead to immediate bloodshed and calamity, with great uncertainty as to the issue. The coercion we recommended was coercion by the united authority of Europe, and we always contended that in the case where the united authority of Europe was brought into action, there was no fear of having to proceed to actual coercion. The Turk knew very well how to measure strength on one side and the other, and he would have yielded to that authority. But no, there must be no coercion under any circumstances. Such was the issue, gentlemen. Well, where do we stand now ? We know what has taken place in the interval. We know that a great work of liberation has been done, in which we have had no part whatever. With the traditions of liberty which we think we cherish, with the recollection that you Scotchmen entertain of the struggles in which you have engaged to establish your own liberties here, a great work of emancipation has been going on in the world, and you have been prevented by your Government from any share in it whatever. But bitter as is the mortification with which I for one reflect upon that exclusion, I thank God that the work has been done. It has been done in one sense, perhaps, by the most inappropriate of instruments ; but I rejoice in the result, that six or seven millions of people who were in partial subjection have been brought into total independence, and many millions more who were in absolute subjection to the Ottoman rule have been brought into a state which, if not one of total independence, yet is one of practical liberation actually attained, or very shortly to be realized—practical liberation from the worst of the evils which they suffered.

But what happens now ? Why, it appears the Turk is going to be coerced after all. But is not it a most astounding fact that the Government, who said they would on no consideration coerce the Turk, and who said that if Europe attempted to coerce the Turk nothing but misery could result, now expects to coerce the Turk by sending an order to Admiral Hornby at Malta, and desiring him to sail with his fleet into the east of the Mediterranean ? Now, gentlemen, neither you nor I are acquainted with the whole of the circumstances attendant upon these measures. We don't know the reasons of State that have brought about this extraordinary result. But what I have pointed out to you is this, that Her Majesty's Government have in matter of fact come round to the very principle upon which they compelled the Liberals to join issue with them two or three years ago—the very principle which they then declared to be totally inadmissible, and for urging which upon them, their agents and organs through the country have been incessantly maintaining that nothing but the spirit of faction could have induced us to do anything so monstrous. That which nothing but the spirit of faction could have induced us to do, is embraced in principle by Her Majesty's Government. But is it embraced in the same form ? No. We said : Let coercion be applied by the united authority of Europe—that is to say, for it is not an exaggeration so to put it, by the united authority of the civilized world applicable to this case. Our American friends have too remote an interest in it to take part. God forbid I should exclude them from the civilized world ; but it was by the united authority of Europe that we demanded it. It is now attempted by the single authority and by the single hand of England. Will it succeed ? All I can say is this, if it be directed to good and honest ends, to practical improvement, with all my heart I hope it may ; but it may not, and then where is the responsibility ? Where is the responsibility of those who refused to allow all Europe to act in unison, and who then took upon themselves this single-handed action ? If it fails, they incur an immense responsibility. If it succeeds, it only becomes the more plain that had they but acceded to the advice which was at first so humbly tendered by the Liberal party, and which only after a long time was vigorously pressed—had they then acceded to the view of the Liberal party, and allowed Turkey to be dealt with as she ought to have been dealt with at the close of the Constantinople Conference, Turkey would have given way at once. The Power which yields to one State

would still more readily have yielded to the united voice of the six great States. The concessions to be made by her would then have been made, and the horrors and the bloodshed, the loss of life and treasure, the heartburnings, the difficulties, the confusion, and the anarchy that have followed, would all of them have been saved.

Therefore, gentlemen, I say that our present embarrassments are of our own creation. It would be a very cruel thing to hold the present Government responsible for the existence of an Eastern Question that from time to time troubles Europe. I have not held them so responsible. I hold them responsible for having interrupted that concerted action which, it is as evident as considerations of sense and policy can make it—which could not have failed to attain its effect ; and for now being driven to make the same effort, with diminished resources, in greater difficulties, and after the terrible penalties of an almost immeasurable bloodshed had been paid.

Now, gentlemen, all this, and a great deal more than this, has to be said, which cannot be said now. Neither your patience nor my strength could enable me to say it. I have detained you at great length. I have only opened, as it were, these questions. I have not even touched the great number of important subjects in which you naturally, as men of Scotland and men of Midlothian, feel very special interest. I will, however, gentlemen, for this day bid you farewell. But I shall say one word in closing, and it is this. It is constantly said by the Government, and it is a fair claim on their part, that they have been supported by large majorities in the House of Commons. It is a very fair claim, indeed, for a certain purpose. I should, indeed, have something to say upon the other side—viz. this, that you will find in no instance that I am aware of in history, neither in the American War nor in the great Revolutionary War, nor at any period known to me, has objection been taken, persistently and increasingly taken, by such large fractions of the House of Commons—not less, at any rate, than two-fifths of the House, sometimes more—to the foreign policy of the Government, as during this great controversy. The fact is, gentlemen, that in matters of foreign policy it does require, and it ought to require, very great errors and very great misdeeds on the part of the Government to drive a large portion of Parliament into opposition. It is most important to maintain our national unity in the face of the world. I, for my part, have always admitted, and admit now, that our responsi-

bility in opposing the Government has been immense, but their responsibility in refusing to do right has been still greater. Still they are right in alleging that they have been supported by large majorities. Pray, consider what that means. That is a most important proposition; it is a proposition that ought to come home to the mind of every one here. It means this, that though I have been obliged all through this discourse to attack the Government, I am really attacking the majority of the House of Commons. Please to consider that you might, if you like, strike out of my speech all reference to the Government, all reference to any name, all reference to the body.

It is no longer the Government with which you have to deal. You have to deal with the majority of the House of Commons. The majority of the House of Commons has completely acquitted the Government. Upon every occasion when the Government has appealed to it, the majority of the House of Commons has been ready to answer to the call. Hardly a man has ever hesitated to grant the confidence that was desired, however outrageous in our view the nature of the demand might be. Completely and bodily, the majority of the House of Commons has taken on itself the responsibility of the Government—and not only the collective majority of the House of Commons, gentlemen. If you had got to deal with them by a vote of censure on that majority in the lump, that would be a very ineffective method of dealing. They must be dealt with individually. That majority is made up of units. It is the unit with which you have got to deal. And let me tell you that the occasion is a solemn one; for as I am the first to aver that now fully and bodily the majority of the House of Commons has, in the face of the country, by a multitude of repeated and deliberate acts, made itself wholly and absolutely responsible in the whole of these transactions that I have been commenting upon, and in many more; and as the House of Commons has done that, so upon the coming general election will it have to be determined whether that responsibility, so shifted from an Administration to a Parliament, shall again be shifted from a Parliament to a nation. As yet the nation has had no opportunity. Nay, as I pointed out early in these remarks, the Government do not seem disposed to give them the opportunity. To the last moment, so far as we are informed by the best authorities, they intend to withhold it. The nation, therefore, is not yet responsible. If faith has been broken, if blood has been needlessly shed, if the name of England has been

discredited and lowered from that lofty standard which it ought to exhibit to the whole world, if the country has been needlessly distressed, if finance has been thrown into confusion, if the foundations of the Indian Empire have been impaired, all these things as yet are the work of an Administration and a Parliament ; but the day is coming, and is near at hand, when that event will take place which will lead the historian to declare whether or not they are the work, not of an Administration and not of a Parliament, but the work of a great and a free people. If this great and free and powerful people is disposed to associate itself with such transactions, if it is disposed to assume upon itself what some of us would call the guilt, and many of us must declare to be the heavy burden, of all those events that have been passing before our eyes, it rests with them to do it. But, gentlemen, let every one of us resolve in his inner conscience, before God and before man—let him resolve that he at least will have no share in such a proceeding ; that he will do his best to exempt himself ; that he will exempt himself from every participation in what he believes to be mischievous and ruinous misdeeds ; that, so far as his exertions can avail, no trifling, no secondary consideration shall stand in the way of them, or abate them ; that he will do what in him lies to dissuade his countrymen from arriving at a resolution so full of mischief, of peril, and of shame.

Gentlemen, this is the issue which the people of this country will have to try. Our minds are made up. You and they have got to speak. I for my part have done and will do the little that rests with me to make clear the nature of the great controversy that is to be decided ; and I say from the bottom of my soul, “ God speed the right.”

## THE OATHS BILL

APRIL 26, 1883

The Affirmation Bill, which would have anticipated the present law, and enabled all Members of Parliament who had scruples about taking an oath to make a simple declaration of their allegiance, was introduced by Gladstone's Government as the result of a personal controversy which need not now be revived. This speech, delivered on the second reading of the Bill, lifts the subject far above the level of the moment, and deals with the injustice, as well as the inexpediency, of imposing religious tests as a qualification for political duties. The second reading was rejected by a majority of three. But the fate of the measure was undoubtedly due to the circumstances in which legislation was proposed, and had little connexion with the main principles to which Gladstone chiefly devoted himself. His own view of the case, however, included an element not usually comprehended in the discussion of such matters. Most Liberals then, and most people now, consider that the functions of Parliament are purely secular, and that if a man is returned to the House of Commons by the suffrage of his fellow-citizens, he must be presumed capable of discharging his Parliamentary duties. It is also generally regarded as impossible to exclude by any religious test either hypocritical conformists or those who will go through any religious ceremony for the very reason that they believe all religious ceremonies to be unmeaning.

Gladstone devoted a large part of his speech to an elaborate and sustained argument, showing that the Legislature had gradually parted with one religious safeguard after another, until nothing was left but abstract and unqualified Theism, such as Lucretius held. The House had admitted Nonconformists, including of course Unitarians; had relieved Quakers from the oath; had admitted Roman Catholics; had admitted Jews. Was it worth while to retain as compulsory in all cases a formula which did not really imply anything more than a bare acknowledgment that there was a divine principle in the world? Nowhere can there be found a more impressive presentation of this view than the speech which follows.

Legislation upon this subject has followed in England a course rather of practical compromise than of political principle. The theory of English law was that every citizen must be a member of the Established Church. This theory was far older than the Reformation, and Roman Catholics were not legally excluded from Parliament until the oath of abjuration was imposed in the reign of Charles the Second. After that they could not sit until the Catholic Emancipation Act removed their disabilities in 1829. Nonconformists who were not Quakers, and had no scruple against oaths, were never disqualified from Parliament, though before 1828 they could hold no municipal office without taking the Sacrament in their parish church. Jews were shut out by the words in the oath, "on the true faith of a Christian," till 1858, when it was provided by statute that either House of Parliament might dispense with the use of this formula. The question of admitting an Atheist had never been raised before 1880, although in the eighteenth

century there must have been many Members of Parliament besides Gibbon, and in the nineteenth century there must have been many besides Mill, who regarded Christianity as an exploded superstition. A few years after the defeat of the Affirmation Bill a similar measure passed both Houses, and became law, with very little controversy, when a Conservative Government was in office.

SIR, strictly speaking, it is no part of my duty to do more than to follow, as well as I can, the arguments which have been used against this Bill. It appears to me, however, that while the real issue to be dealt with is not a very wide one, the debate has been extraordinarily prolonged by the introduction into it of extraneous matter. The debate has, undoubtedly, been an animated one. On the other side of the House all that sarcasm and invective could do, all the interest which could be supplied by assaults on the Government and by lengthened details of its iniquitous proceedings, has been called into requisition, I will not say with the purpose, but undoubtedly with the effect, of very greatly widening the field of contention, without, I think, the compensating effect of clearing the judgment of hon. Members. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down<sup>1</sup> has made a most temperate speech, and in consequence he cannot have failed to perceive that the portion of the discussion which was occupied with his speech was less animated than most of the debate during which gentlemen on his side of the House were speaking. I may say, however, that I do not defend my noble and learned friend the Lord Chancellor<sup>2</sup> against his invective. I leave him subject to the whole weight of the censure which has been pronounced by the hon. Member, although, being an argumentative censure, it might, perhaps, have not been difficult to defend the noble and learned Lord. The hon. Member has said but two things that really bear upon the question at issue, or which could possibly be held to be in the nature of an argument against the Bill. One is that the voice of the country, as shown by Petitions, is against the Bill, and the other is that by the law at this moment an Atheist cannot sit in the House. (LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: An avowed Atheist.) Of course, I do not speak of persons whose opinions are concealed. My contention is exactly the reverse of the hon. Member's. I will not say what is the intention of the law, because with that I have nothing to do; but I say that there is no legislative power whatever that can prevent Atheists duly elected from sitting in this House; and I think, moreover, that the hon. Member himself will meet me so

<sup>1</sup> Sir H. Drummond Wolff.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Selborne.

far as to say that it was an accident—for it is an accident relatively to this argument—that led to the disclosure of Mr. Bradlaugh's opinions, and which established the steps to be taken which excluded Mr. Bradlaugh from this House. But an Atheist, however notorious, who has published in the columns of the newspapers of the very morning that he comes to the Table of this House to take the Oath the fullest declaration of his Atheism, is not a person whom the hon. gentleman, or this House, has any power whatever to exclude. If he—whether well-advised or ill-advised is not the question—chooses to take the Oath, there is no power whatever to prevent him. As I have said, there are many collateral matters which have been introduced into this debate, and some of them it is my duty to notice. The debate has proceeded so far that it has become perfectly practicable to understand, after the lucid statement of my hon. and learned friend near me,<sup>1</sup> what is the tone and what are the objections of those who are against the Bill. In the first place, it has been said that this Bill ought to have been mentioned in the Queen's Speech, and the Government have been complained of for not having given it a place in that Speech. In our view, however, this was a Bill which ought not to have been mentioned in the Queen's Speech. It is the duty of the Government, before they advise Her Majesty as to her Speech, to make choice, according to the legislative requirements of the country, of certain topics which they think it is within the power of the House of Commons and most for the interest of the country to deal with ; and they should make their choice upon grounds of broad and general interest. This, Sir, is a question in quite a different category. My noble friend the Secretary of State for War<sup>2</sup> signified—and, I think, with perfect truth—that this was not a question to which, on general grounds of legislative urgency, it would be our duty to give precedence over the multitude of general subjects now standing in arrear. This measure is of a totally different character ; it is a question upon which it was our duty to consider what was the position of the House of Commons, just as last year it was our duty to consider the position of the House with regard to the question of procedure, and to invite the House to deal with it even to the prejudice of the legislation of the year. We thought it did appertain, both to the dignity of the House of Commons and to the interest of the country, that this painful controversy which has subsisted so long should be brought to a close ; and that there should be no

<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry James (Attorney General).

<sup>2</sup> Lord Hartington.

longer the temptation which has existed in this House to deal with matters strictly judicial in a temper and with indications not always presenting the best features of the judicial character. We thought, Sir, such scenes as have been witnessed here, when the dignity of the House and directions of the House have had to be supported by physical force, ought not to be repeated—and ought not to be repeated especially when we had reason to believe that increased pain and increased scandal might attend their repetition. It was, therefore, on grounds special to the position of the House of Commons in this matter that we thought this question entitled to take precedence of some others, and to be a primary one in regard to the procedure of this House, although it was a secondary one in its dignity so far as the order of legislation was concerned. And, Sir, I may just remind the House that a precisely similar occasion, except that it was, I admit, far less pressing, occurred in the year 1854. In that year Lord John Russell, as Leader in this House, on the part of the Government of Lord Aberdeen, introduced a Bill for the purpose of altering the Parliamentary Oaths Act, with a view to the further relief of Roman Catholics, and to the general simplification of the Oath. That, certainly, was a Bill of much wider scope than the present, for it went to re-cast the law with regard to the duties of Members generally ; and it corresponded in substance with the Bill afterwards introduced and passed, and now forming the fundamental Statute on the subject—the Act of 1866. And yet that Bill of 1854 was never mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Well, Sir, I am afraid that, after what we have heard from some gentlemen opposite, and, most of all, from the right hon. gentleman the late Home Secretary,<sup>1</sup> I shall make a very dull, unexciting, and uninteresting speech ; for, unlike him, I do not mean to accuse anybody of anything. Nor shall I travel in detail over the numerous points of the vehement attack of the right hon. gentleman. I will, however, refer to a single point. The right hon. gentleman said that we had deprived our Bill of retrospective action ; that the Bill introduced in 1880 included retrospective action, and that this change was, on our part, in the moderate language that the right hon. gentleman thought fit to adopt, “ a most despicable trick.” Let me explain this “ despicable trick.” In the year 1880 the law had never been determined on the optional right of a Member to affirm. Consequently, Mr. Bradlaugh, who sought to affirm, had been returned by his con-

<sup>1</sup> Sir R. Assheton Cross.

stituents without any knowledge on their part that he was precluded from taking his seat by affirming. That being so, when we thought it expedient to ask the House to change the existing law, we thought it right also that that change should be made retrospective, so that his constituents, who have committed no offence against the known law of the land, might not suffer. But the case now is fundamentally changed. I am not finding fault with the constituency—it is no part of my duty to do so—but the case now is this—that the Courts of Justice have declared that Mr. Bradlaugh is not entitled to affirm. The constituency returned Mr. Bradlaugh a second time, with the full knowledge that that declaration of the law had been made; and we therefore considered that we should not ask the House to make the present Bill retrospective in its action. The constituency before was unwarned; the constituency now is forewarned. We deal in one way with the constituency unwarned. We deal in another way with the constituency forewarned; and that is what the right hon. gentleman, in his moderation of language, thinks fit to characterize as a “most despicable trick.”

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS: I was referring to the Bill as brought in this year. I said that after the constituency had learnt that Mr. Bradlaugh could not take his seat they elected him again, and that to bring in the Bill of this year, after that, was a despicable trick.

MR. GLADSTONE: It seems to me that it is an extraordinary doctrine to hold, that if a Government, upon full and further consideration of the particulars bearing upon a point of this kind, sees cause to come to a certain conclusion, that that is a “despicable trick.” The question is—Is the conclusion a right one or a wrong one? If the conclusion is a right one, I want to know what title the right hon. gentleman has to characterize it, in his moderate language, as a “despicable trick”? The ground upon which we make, or propose to make, an alteration in the Bill is the ground I have stated. Now, it is said—“You ought not to alter the law for the sake of one person.” But it so happens that these laws are commonly altered for the sake of one person. It is in the case of some one person that a principle is raised and a matter brought to an issue. Was not the case of Mr. O’Connell a case in point? (“No!” *from some Irish Members.*) I say, upon the Parliamentary history of the question, there is nothing more clear or better known than this—that it was the election of Mr. O’Connell for the county of Clare that brought the Roman

Catholic question to an issue ; and now the allegation is not that Mr. Bradlaugh has nobody behind him, but that his is the sole case presented. Certainly, I must say that this is a curious objection to proceed from the Party opposite, because it has had to deal with the question for removing religious disabilities. After having most stoutly opposed the admission of Jews to Parliament, upon principles quite as high, and with motives quite as conscientious, as those on which they are now acting, when they came into Office they introduced a Bill for their admission. And how did that Bill run ? It ran in this precise form. It makes provision for altering the law and Rules of the Houses of Parliament upon the presentation of one person. I will not read the whole of the clause ; but it runs thus—" When it shall appear that a person " —*a person* (*Cries of " Temporary."*) It was nothing of the kind. If the hon. and learned Member opposite will have the kindness to wait a moment he will see from the following part that it is an act to be done from time to time, and, consequently, an act to be done when the case should arise as to one person. The clause provides that—

" When it shall appear to either House of Parliament that a person is prevented from taking his seat," by the then condition of the law, " such House may resolve that henceforth *any* person "

may come and take his seat upon the conditions therein provided. So that the law was fixed by each House ; and it was deliberately arranged by the action of a Government representing the views of gentlemen opposite that when a Jew was found to be excluded by the state of the law, it was thenceforward open to each House, if it thought fit, to admit, once for all, that Jew, and every other Jew after him, who should apply to be admitted. Now, we are asked, what is to be done about Peers ? What is to be done about aliens and about felons ? I am not sure the objection did not proceed from some legal authority, that if we pass this Bill, we should be in a difficult position with regard to the present disqualification of aliens, felons, or Peers. (LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL : The clergy.) No ; I beg pardon. The case of clergymen I put upon an entirely different footing altogether. I gather from the interruption of the noble Lord that he thinks it is a matter of high and sacred duty to rigid Constitutional principles to exclude clergymen from this House. I hold it, on the contrary, to be a matter exceedingly open to discussion, and merely a policy of expediency, involving no Constitutional principle whatever. But with regard to aliens, Peers, and felons—though I

am sorry to place the Peers in such company—their disqualification rests upon the ancient and well-understood principles of the Common Law of England. The disqualification of the unbeliever rests upon nothing of the sort. I think my hon. and learned friend the other night distinctly demonstrated that by the Common Law of England there is no disqualification of this character. I know it is said that Christianity is part of the Common Law ; but am I to be told that, if it is so, every man who is not a Christian is an offender against the Common Law ? If so, it is an extraordinary mode of interpreting the law. But it has been shown that no Oath or religious test of any kind was ever used by this House as a condition precedent to entrance into it until the Reign of Elizabeth ; and that, when an Oath was then introduced, it was not introduced in the slightest degree as a religious test. (MR. NEWDEGATE signified dissent.) I will show my hon. friend—if he will allow me to call him so, and I think, after having sat opposite to him for forty years, I am entitled to use that term—I will show my hon. friend that it is so. I will give a proof of that, and it is that the religious test was then applied to Commoners only and not to Peers, and the Act of Parliament declared the reason why it was applied to Commoners and not to Peers, “ Because ”—so ran the Act—“ we are otherwise persuaded by sufficient means, of the loyalty of the Peers.” Therefore, it was a simple mode of ascertaining loyalty to the institutions of the country, and not of imposing religious disability. I venture to say, as a matter of history, that that was the principle of our law down to the year 1828. If that be so, I think it will be very difficult to maintain that there is any disqualification of the unbeliever by the Common Law of England. You may tell me that it was not then merely a question of the admission of Atheists to this House, but a question of permitting them to live. That was perfectly true, I think, at least down to the year 1614, for as late as that year the ancestors of those of us who are of English blood burnt a certain person for deficiencies in respect of belief. He was not, however, an Atheist ; he was an Arian—so that people had better look out if this doctrine comes again into vogue. The fact is, that the State gradually adopted the principles of toleration, but, where it tolerated, it did not interpose barriers against access to this House. That is the historical principle which, I think, it will be found difficult to shake. In 1828 it appears to have been the view of the Legislature that no one should come into the House—however loyal, however competent

—without being bound to profess the faith of a Christian ; but it is a totally different matter for us to deal with a statutory disability created in 1828, or another statutory disability created a century before in the case of the clergy, and to deal with disqualifications like those of aliens and felons, which are founded on reason, and which are established by the ancient Common Law of the land. Well, some gentlemen say there are a great many Petitions against this Bill, and that they are far more numerous than any Petitions in its favour. I think there may have been some exaggeration in this matter ; but the late Home Secretary said—I presume by mistake—that the President of the Wesleyan Conference had signed a Petition on behalf of that Body against the Bill. That has been decidedly disclaimed by the rev. gentleman himself.

SIR R. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was glad to have an opportunity of explaining that the Petition sent to him was signed on behalf of the Committee of the Conference, of which the President was Chairman ; but the words were those of the Secretary, who sent it.

MR. GLADSTONE : I understand it was a mistake. The impression had gone abroad that the head of the Wesleyan Body has signed a Petition against the Bill ; but this gentleman himself had disclaimed having done so. I have received a letter myself signed by Dr. Kennedy, hon. Secretary of the three denominations of Protestant Dissenting ministers, in which he says—

“ I have the honour of forwarding for presentation a Petition from the general body of the three denominations of Protestant Dissenting ministers in and around the City of London and Westminster in favour of the Bill.”

But I think it is only just to this gentleman and those on whose behalf he writes to read out some additional words. He says—

“ The personal associations which are at present connected with the objects contemplated in this Bill are so painful and offensive to the body which I represent, that nothing but a strong sense of duty would induce them to send this Petition to the House.”

These words have a very deep meaning. Do you suppose that we do not feel pain ? Do you suppose that we are unaware how difficult—how all but impracticable—it has become to do what we believe to be strict justice in the face of such associations ? If you do not know this, you ought to know it ; and if you do know it, you ought not, from your place in this House, to deride us, and sarcastically to advise us to inscribe upon our banner

“Bradlaugh and Blasphemy.” Sir, I believe that every one of us intending to vote for this Bill feels that it is indeed difficult to do justice under such circumstances. But the difficulty is the measure of the duty and the honour ; and just as if we were in the jury box, and a person stood before us under a criminal charge, we will put a strong hand of self-restraint upon ourselves, and we will take care that full justice—nothing more and nothing less—shall be awarded to every citizen of England. In these considerations, as I believe and am persuaded, is to be found the reason why so many who feel it a duty to support this Bill have, notwithstanding, shrunk from exposing themselves to the odium so very freely cast on its supporters by those who oppose it. But I am bound to say a little more than that. The people who have subscribed Petitions against this Bill are very numerous. I think they may be four times the number of those who have subscribed in favour of it. I speak of their motives with the most unfeigned respect. I am persuaded that they have acted under the influence of what are called, and justly called, religious instincts. In my opinion, upon broad questions of principle, which stand out disentangled from the surrounding facts, the immediate instincts and sense of the people are very generally right. (*Opposition cheers.*) I am heartily glad to find that there is an echo to that sentiment from the quarter from which these sounds have just proceeded. But I cannot say that this is a uniform and unbending rule. It does, unfortunately, sometimes happen that, when broad principles are disguised by the incidents of the case, the momentary opinion, guided by the instincts of the populace—though I do not admit that it is at all proved that it is the vast mass of the population which has petitioned in the present case—is not a safe guide. If I were to make an exception to the general rule as to the justice of the instincts of the people—and it is an exception not dishonourable to them—I should trust them far more upon questions where their own interests are concerned than on questions where the prepossessions of religion are concerned. The latter is a class of questions on which we must be careful against taking momentary indications of public feeling for our guide. They express the feelings, as opposed, in many instances, to the judgment, of the people. This is no assumption of mine ; and I would ask those who have studied the history of the year 1829, when the great Act of Roman Catholic Emancipation was passed—do they believe that that Act of Emancipation at the moment represented the feelings of the majority of the people of Great

Britain? No, Sir; it was distinctly against them. It was a combination of the guides of the people, who took upon them the duty of instructing the people. It was the Leaders, not on one side, but on both sides, who, superior to the temptation of gathering momentary profit from an appeal to religious prejudice, took upon themselves the responsibility, in their capacity as legislators, of doing that which they believed and knew to be right, trusting to the people to do them justice and to recognize their motives. Am I to go back further into history? I might quote cases of popular risings under the influence of not untrue, though misguided religious instincts, which have disgraced the annals of this country. I will give an instance which I think a very fair one. It will be remembered that, about 130 years ago, this House and the Legislature passed an Act for the purpose of naturalizing the Jews. A great popular movement immediately took place against it. Are you to look back upon that movement, and say—"Poor, ignorant wretches, what compassion we feel for you"? No, Sir; these men, according to the knowledge and feelings of their day, were acting under the same impulses and upon the same principles as the Petitioners of to-day. They thought that to admit the professor of another religion, founded upon or absolutely involving the denial of Him who is the Alpha and Omega of our religion—they thought, or at least their instincts told them, that there was something in that Act which tended to impair the Christianity of the country; and there is precisely the same feeling now, only allowing for the difference that has since been made in the political education of the country, that is conveyed in these Petitions. It often happens that a private person is called upon to rule and overrule his impulses and feelings. So it must be in the State; and what the sovereign reason ought to do in the individual, the Leaders of Parties ought to do in the State. It is nothing but a combination of the Leaders of Parties that can direct aright questions of this kind, where religious prepossessions are involved, where the facts are but very partially known out-of-doors, and where the people have no means of sounding the difficult legal questions and complicated arguments that puzzle even many Members of this House. If these Leaders of Parties do not see their way to the performance of that duty, or think their duty lies in the opposite direction, then I, for my part, cannot be surprised that large numbers of the people should under the influence of sentiments which I regard with the highest respect and honour, take a direction which I believe to be wrong, and

which I am convinced is unjust. The right hon. gentleman the late Home Secretary <sup>1</sup> the other night spent more than half an hour by that clock in detailing the guilty conduct of the Government in regard to Mr. Bradlaugh. (*Opposition Cheers.*) I did not require the assurance that hon. gentlemen opposite were pleased. They showed me on Monday night that they were extremely pleased. They would have been pleased if, instead of half an hour, he had taken an hour and a half upon topics so inviting and racy in their character. But the question I humbly put to these hon. gentlemen is, what is the matter? Supposing it were all true—supposing it were not half adequate, as a description of what they think the true guilt of the Government—it has nothing whatever to do with the question before us. If the Bill were the best Bill upon earth, it ought to pass if the conduct of the Government were ever so bad; but if the Bill be a bad Bill, it ought not to be passed, though the conduct of the Government may have been ever so good.

But I shall very briefly, and I hope in not more than one-tenth part of the time used by the right hon. gentleman, reply that I do not resent the words that have been used, and I do it the more freely because it is the pleasure of hon. Members opposite to ascribe to me a peculiar sympathetic enthusiasm in this cause—to imagine that, by some latent affinity, or on some other inscrutable ground, I am possessed with a missionary zeal in driving forward with all my might the admission of Atheists to the House of Commons. What I wish to point out is this—we have rendered no assistance whatever to Mr. Bradlaugh. Did the House of Lords assist Mr. Bradlaugh last week? Did Lord Coleridge assist Mr. Bradlaugh last week? (“Yes!” and “Oh, oh!”) If you mean that the effect of what we have done has been in the direction of admitting Mr. Bradlaugh to this House, that I do not deny; but the House of Lords and Lord Coleridge have no more assisted Mr. Bradlaugh than the two Courts which declared one after the other that he had no title to affirm in this House have opposed him. Our contention has been all along that, from the first to the last, with much less perfect and available means of judgment than Judges in Courts of Justice, we have been under precisely the same obligations. We have endeavoured to keep the proceedings of this House within the bounds of law and of Constitutional order; and it is no secret to you that in our opinion they have not been kept within those bounds, owing to

<sup>1</sup> Sir R. Assheton Cross.

the voice of a majority which requires from us a respectful obedience, but which requires and is entitled to nothing more. The right hon. gentleman opposite says that three times I abdicated the position of Leader of this House. Sir, if the words are to be used at all, it is not a case of abdication, but of deposition. But I am astonished at the doctrine of the right hon. gentleman. He knows our ground. He knows that we were insisting upon what we thought our judicial duty; and yet he affirms that when a view of judicial duty opposite to ours has been taken, we, who had been acting in the name of judicial duty, were to become instruments to devise the means of giving effect to the judgment of our opponents. I repel and repudiate, with all my soul, that servile proposition. I am willing to part with the seat and with the place I hold; but I am not willing for one moment to give in to such a doctrine. We have endeavoured to support to the best of our power the Executive authority of the House (*Opposition cries of "No, no!"*) That cry of "No!" only shows that the facts have not been carefully watched; but to ask us to take upon ourselves the responsibility of applying votes of this House which we believe to involve radical injustice, and which, I believe, speaking for myself, without hesitation or scruple, to be such as, in the case of a minor authority, would be termed illegal—to ask me to make myself an instrument of devising means for carrying such votes into effect—that, Sir, is a demand which I utterly reject, and which I hold to be totally unsupported by any fact that has occurred in the best ages of our Parliamentary tradition. I must say I think it is very strange that these accusations should be brought. It may be that hon. gentlemen opposite have something to bias them towards a particular course, which brings political profit. I am making no accusation. I say it may be that they have something to bias them in that direction. But what could we have to bias us in the direction we have taken? Do you suppose that we are ignorant that, in every contested election that has happened since the case of Mr. Bradlaugh came up, you have gained votes and we have lost them? You are perfectly aware of it. We are no less aware of it. But, if you are perfectly aware of it, is not some credit to be given to us who are giving you the same under circumstances rather more difficult—is not some credit to be given to us for presumptive integrity and purity of motive? Sir, the Liberal Party has suffered, and is suffering, on this account. It is not the first time in its history. It is the old story over again. In every controversy that has

arisen about the extension of religious toleration, and about the abatement and removal of disqualifications, in every controversy relating to religious toleration and religious disabilities, the Liberal Party has suffered before, and it is now, perhaps, suffering again ; and yet it has not been a Party which, upon the whole, has had, during the last half century, the smallest or the feeblest hold upon the affections and approval of the people. Who suffered from the Protestantism of the country ? It was that Party—with valuable aid from individuals, but only individuals, who forfeited their popularity on that account—it was that Party who fought the battle of freedom in the case of the great Roman Catholic controversy, when the name of Protestantism was invoked with quite as great effect as the name of Theism is now, and the Petitions poured in quite as freely then as at present. Protestantism stood the shock of the Act of 1829. Then came on the battle of Christianity, and the Christianity of the country was said to be sacrificed by the Liberal Party. There are gentlemen on the other side of the House who seem to have forgotten all that has occurred, and who are pluming themselves on the admission of Jews into Parliament, as if they had not resisted it with perfect honesty—I make no charge against their honour, and impute no unworthy motive—as if they had not resisted it with quite as much resolution as they are exhibiting on the present occasion. Sir, what I hope is this—that the Liberal Party will not be deterred, by fear or favour, from working steadily onward in the path which it believes to be the path of equity and justice. There is no greater honour to a man than to suffer for what he thinks to be righteous ; and there is no greater honour to a Party than to suffer in the endeavour to give effect to the principles which they believe to be just.

Up to this time I have detained the House on what I take to be extraneous and collateral matter, but matter which has been largely introduced into the speeches we have heard in the course of this debate. Now, let us try and get at the heart of the argument, which, after all, is not a very complex, although I must say it is historically, and from every point of view, an extremely interesting matter. The business of every man in controversy is to try to find out what is the main and governing contention of his adversary. Sir, I have laboured to find that out, and I think I have probably found it : I hope so. As I read it, the governing contention is this—that the main question for the State is not what religion a man professes, but whether he professes

some religion or none. I was in hopes of receiving some confirmatory testimony from the other side. I might dispense with proofs, but I will give them. The right hon. gentleman who led the opposition to this Bill said that this was not a question of difference of religion, but that it was a question between religion and irreligion—between religion and the absence of all religion—and clearly the basis of the right hon. gentleman's speech was not that we were to tolerate any belief, but that we were not to tolerate no belief. I mean by tolerating to admit, to recognize, to legislate for the purpose of permitting entrance into the House of Commons. My hon. friend the Member for Finsbury,<sup>1</sup> in an able speech, still more clearly expressed similar views. He referred to the ancient controversies as all very well; they touched, he said, excrescences, and not the vital substance. Now, Sir, I want to examine what is the vital substance, and what are the excrescences. He went further than this, and used a most apt, appropriate, expressive, and still more significant phrase. He said—"Yes; it is true you admit religions some of which may go near the precipice; but now you ask us to go over it." Gentlemen opposite cheered loudly when that was said by the hon. gentleman behind me. They will not give me a single cheer now. They suspect I am quoting this with some evil intent. The question is, am I quoting them fairly? or is it the fact that some gentlemen have not sufficiently and fairly considered their relation to the present Bill, except that they mean to oppose whatever proceeds from the Government? But my hon. friend has considered very well what he said when he used the remarkable simile about the precipice. I wish to see what is the value of this main and principal contention—this doctrine of the precipice—this question between religion and irreligion, between some belief which is to be tolerated, and no belief which cannot be tolerated—that is to say so far as it relates to admission into this House. The hon. and learned gentleman the Member for Launceston<sup>2</sup> held exactly the same language. He adopted a phrase which had fallen from the hon. Member for Portsmouth<sup>3</sup> which he thought had been unfairly applied; and he said he wished that there should be some form of belief and some recognition of belief—something of what is called in philosophical discussion the recognition of the supernatural. That, I believe, is a phrase which goes as near to what hon. gentlemen opposite mean as

<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. T. McC. Torrens.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Hardinge Giffard.

<sup>3</sup> Sir H. Drummond Wolff.

anything can. It is the recognition of the existence, at any rate, of the supernatural that is wanted. That is the main contention of the Party opposite ; and what I want to know is, whether that contention—that proposition—offers us a good solid standing-ground for legislation. Whatever test is applied—the test of the Constitution, the test of civil and political freedom, or, above all, the test of religion, and of reverence for religious conviction, I do not hesitate to say that, confidently as I support this Bill, there is no ground upon which I support it with so much confidence, as because of what I think is the utter hollowness and falseness of the argument that is expressed in the words I have just cited, and in the idea that is at the bottom of those words, and the danger of making them the basis of Constitutional action. Sir, what does this contention do ? In the first place, it evidently violates civil freedom to this extent—that, in the words of Lord Lyndhurst—which are as wide as anything that any gentleman on this side could desire—there is to be a total divorce between the question of religious differences and the question of civil privilege and power ; that there is to be no test whatever applied to a man with respect to the exercise of civil functions, except the test of civil capacity, and a fulfilment of civil conditions. Those were the words of Lord Lyndhurst—those are the words on which we stand. It is now proposed to depart from this position, and to say that a certain class of persons, perhaps a very narrow class—I do not argue that now—because it is said to have no religion is to be excepted, and alone excepted, from the operation of that great and broad principle. In my opinion, it is in the highest degree irrational to lay down a broad principle of that kind, and after granting 99-100ths of all, it means, to stop short, in order to make an invidious exclusion of the exceedingly limited number of persons who may possibly be affected by, and concerned in, its application. Hon. gentlemen will, perhaps, be startled when I make my next objection to the contention of the opponents of the Bill. It is, that it is highly disparaging to Christianity. They invite us to do that which, as a Legislature, we ought never to do—namely, to travel over theological ground, and, having taken us upon that ground, what is it that they tell us ? They tell us that you may go any length you please in the denial of religion, provided only you do not reject the name of the Deity. They tear religion—if I may say so—in shreds, and they set aside one particular shred of it, with which nothing will ever induce them to part. They divide religion into the dispensable

and the indispensable—I am not speaking now of the cases of those who declare, or who are admitted under special laws, and I am not speaking of Jews or any of those who make declarations—I am speaking of those for whom no provision is made, except the provision of the Oath, let that be clearly understood—they divide, I say, religion into what can be dispensed with and what cannot be dispensed with, and then they find that Christianity can be dispensed with. I am not willing, Sir, that Christianity, if an appeal is made to us as a Christian Legislature, should stand in any rank lower than that which is indispensable. Let me illustrate what I mean. Supposing a commander has to despatch a small body of men for the purpose of some difficult and important undertaking. They are to go without baggage and without appliances. Everything they take they must carry on their backs. They have to dispense with all luxuries and all comforts, and to take with them only that which is essential. That is precisely the same course which you ask us to take in drawing us upon theological ground. You require us to distinguish between superfluities and necessities, and you say in regard to Christianity—“Oh, that is one of the superfluities—that is one of the excrescences, that has nothing to do with the vital substance—the great and solemn name of the Deity—which is indispensable.” The adoption of such a proposition as that—and it is at the very root of your contention—seems to me to be in the highest degree disparaging to the Christian faith. I pass to another point. The hon. Member for Finsbury <sup>1</sup> made a reference to Mr. O’Connell, whom he stated that he knew well. I will not say, Sir, that I had as much personal knowledge of Mr. O’Connell as my hon. friend may have had, though I did know something of him personally, as well as politically; but, when I was a very young man, in the second year of my sitting in Parliament—in the old House which was burned down half a century ago—I heard a speech from Mr. O’Connell, which, although at that time I was bound by Party allegiance to receive with misgiving and distrust anything he said, made a deep impression upon me, and by which I think I have ever since been guided. It is to be found, not in *Hansard*, but in the record which, for a few years, was more copious even than *Hansard*, and which went under the name of *The Mirror of Parliament*. On the 18th February, 1834, Mr. O’Connell used these words in a speech on the Law of Libel; and I echo every word my hon. friend said with regard to the deep religious con-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. T. McC. Torrens.

victions and the religious consistency of that remarkable man,—he used, Sir, these words—

“ When I see in this country the law allowing men to dispute the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Redeemer, I really think, if I had no other reason, I should be justified in saying that there is nothing beyond that which should be considered worth quarrelling for, or which ought to be made the subject of penal restrictions.”

I am convinced that upon every religious, as well as upon every political ground, the true and the wise course is not to deal out religious liberty by halves, by quarters, and by fractions ; but to deal it out entire, and to leave no distinction between man and man on the ground of religious differences from one end of the land to the other. But, Sir, I go a little further in endeavouring to test and to probe this great religious contention of the “ precipice,” which has been put forward, amidst fervent cheers from hon. gentlemen opposite, by my hon. friend behind me<sup>1</sup> ; and I want to know is your religious distinction a real distinction at all ? I will, for the sake of argument, and for no other purpose whatever, go with you on this dangerous ground of splitting religion into slices, and I ask you—“ Where will you draw the line ? ” You draw it at the point where the abstract denial of God is severed from abstract admission of the Deity. My proposition is, that your line is worthless. There is much on your side of the line which is just as objectionable as the Atheism on the other side. If you call on us to draw these distinctions, let them be rational distinctions. I do not say let them be Christian distinctions ; but let them be rational distinctions. I can understand one rational distinction, that you should frame the Oath in such a way that its terms should recognize, not merely the acknowledgment of the existence of the Deity, but the providence of the Deity, and man’s responsibility to the Deity, and in such a way as to indicate the knowledge in a man’s own mind that he must answer to the Deity for what he does, and is able to do. But is that your present rule ? No, Sir. You know well that from ancient times there have been sects and schools that have admitted in the abstract, just as freely as the Christian admits, the existence of a Deity, but who have held that, though Deity exists, yet of practical relations between Him and man there can be none. Many Members of this House will recollect, perhaps, the noble and majestic lines—for such they are—of the Latin poet—

<sup>1</sup> Mr. W. T. McC. Torrens.

"Omnis enim per se divom natura necesse est,  
Immortali ævo summa cum pace fruatur ;  
Sejuncta a nostris rebus, semotaque longe.  
Nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,  
Ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,  
Nec bene promeritis capitur nec tangitur ira."

"Divinity exists"—as these, I must say, magnificent words set forth—"in remote, inaccessible recesses of which we know nothing ; but with us it has no dealing, with us it has no relation." Sir, I have purposely gone back to ancient times, because the discussion is less invidious than the discussion of modern schools of opinion. But, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that the specific evil, the specific form of irreligion, with which in educated society in this country you have to contend, and with respect to which you ought to be on your guard, is not blank Atheism. That is a rare form of opinion, and it is seldom met with. But what is frequently met with are those various forms of opinion which teach us that whatever there be beyond the visible scene, whatever there be beyond this short span of life, you know and can know nothing of it, and that it is a visionary and a bootless undertaking to endeavour to establish relations with it. That is the specific mischief of the age ; but that mischief you do not attempt to touch. Nay, more ; you glory in the state of the law that now prevails. All differences of religion you wish to tolerate. You wish to allow everybody to enter your Chamber who admits the existence of Deity. You would seek to admit Voltaire. That is a specimen of your toleration. But Voltaire was not a taciturn foe of Christianity. He was the author of that painful and awful phrase that goes to the heart of every Christian—and goes, I believe, to the heart of many a man professing religion who is not a Christian—*écrasez l'infame*. Voltaire was a believer in God ; he would not have had the slightest difficulty in taking the Oath ; and you are working up the country to something like a crusade on this question ; endeavouring to strengthen in the minds of the people the false notion that you have got a real test, a real safeguard ; that Christianity is still generally safe, with certain unavoidable exceptions, under the protecting ægis of the Oath within the walls of this Chamber. And it is for that you are entering on a great religious war ! I hold, then, that this contention of our opponents is disparaging to religion ; it is idle ; and it is also highly irrational. For if you are to have a religious test at all of the kind that you contemplate—the test of Theism, which the hon.

Member for Portsmouth <sup>1</sup> frankly said he wished to adopt—it ought to be a test of a well-ascertained Theism ; not a mere abstract idea dwelling in the air, and in the clouds ; but a practical recognition of a Divine Governing Power, which will some day call all of us to account for every thought we conceive, and for every word we utter.

I fear I have detained the House for a long time. But after all that has been said, and after the flood of accusations and invective that has been poured out, I have thought it right at great length and very seriously to show that, at all events, whether we be beaten or not, we do not decline the battle, and that we are not going to allow it to be said that the interests of religion are put in peril, and that they are to find their defenders only on the opposite side of the House. That sincere and conscientious defenders of those interests are to be found there I do not question at this moment ; but I do contend with my whole heart and soul that the interests of religion, as well as the interests of civil liberty, are concerned in the passage of this measure. My reasons, Sir, for the passing of the Bill may be summed up in a few words. If I were asked to put a construction on this Oath as it stands, I probably should give it a higher meaning than most gentlemen opposite. It is my opinion, as far as I can presume to form one, that the Oath has in it a very large flavour of Christianity. I am well aware that the doctrine of my hon. and learned friend the Attorney General <sup>2</sup> is, that there are other forms of positive attestation, recognized by other systems of religion, which may enable the Oath to be taken by the removal of the words “ So help me God,” and the substitution of some other words, or some symbolical act, involving the idea of Deity, and responsibility to the Deity. But I think we ought to estimate the real character of this Oath according to the intention of the Legislature. The Oath does not consist of spoken words alone. The spoken words are accompanied by the corroborative act of kissing the Book. What is the meaning of that ? According to the intention of the Legislature, I certainly should say that that act is an import of the acceptance of the Divine revelation. There have been other forms in other countries. I believe in Scotland the form is still maintained of holding up the right hand instead of kissing the Book. In Spain the form is, I believe, that of kissing the Cross. In Italy, I think, at one time, the form was that of laying the hand on the Gospel. All these different forms meant, according to the

<sup>1</sup> Sir H. Drummond Wolff.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Henry James

original intention, an acceptance of Christianity. But you do not yourselves venture to say that the law could be applied in that sense. A law of this kind is like a coin spick-and-span brand-new from the Mint carrying upon it its edges in all their sharpness and freshness ; but it wears down in passing from hand to hand, and, though there is a residuum, yet the distinctive features disappear. Whatever my opinion may be as to the original vitality of the Oath, I think there is very little difference of opinion as to what it has now become. It has become, as my hon. friend says, a Theistic test. It is taken as no more than a Theistic test. It does, as I think, involve a reference to Christianity. But while this is my personal opinion, it is not recognized by authority, and, at any rate, does not prevail in practice ; for some gentlemen in the other House of Parliament, if not in this also, have written works against the Christian religion, and yet have taken the Oath. But, undoubtedly, it is not good for any of us to force this test so flavoured, or even if not so flavoured, upon men who cannot take it with a full and a cordial acceptance. It is bad—it is demoralizing to do so. It is all very well to say—“ Oh, yes ; but it is their responsibility.” That is not, in my view, a satisfactory answer. A seat in this House is to the ordinary Englishman in early life, or, perhaps, in middle and mature life, when he has reached a position of distinction in his career, the highest prize of his ambition. But if you place between him and that prize not only the necessity of conforming to certain civil conditions, but the adoption of certain religious words, and if these words are not justly measured to the condition of his conscience and of his convictions, you give him an inducement—nay, I do not go too far when I say you offer him a bribe to tamper with those convictions—to do violence to his conscience in order that he may not be stigmatized by being shut out from what is held to be the noblest privilege of the English citizen—that of representing his fellow-citizens in Parliament. And, therefore, I say that, besides our duty to vindicate the principle of civil and religious liberty, which totally detaches religious controversy from the enjoyment of civil rights, it is most important that the House should consider the moral effect of this test. It is, as the hon. Member for Portsmouth <sup>1</sup> is neither more nor less than right in saying, a purely Theistic test. Viewed as a Theistic test, it embraces no acknowledgment of Providence, of Divine Government, of responsibility, or of retribution. It involves nothing but a bare and abstract

<sup>1</sup> Sir H. Drummond Wolff.

admission—a form void of all practical meaning and concern. This is not a wholesome, but an unwholesome lesson. Yet more. I own that although I am now, perhaps, going to injure myself by bringing the name of Mr. Bradlaugh into this controversy, I am strongly of opinion that the present controversy should come to a close. I have no fear of Atheism in this House. Truth is the expression of the Divine mind ; and however little our feeble vision may be able to discern the means by which God will provide for its preservation, we may leave the matter in His hands, and we may be quite sure that a firm and courageous application of every principle of justice and of equity is the best method we can adopt for the preservation and influence of truth. I must painfully record my opinion that grave injury has been done to religion in many minds—not in instructed minds, but in those which are ill-instructed or partially instructed, which have a large claim on our consideration—in consequence of steps which have, unhappily, been taken. Great mischief has been done in many minds through the resistance offered to the man elected by the constituency of Northampton, which a portion of the community believe to be unjust. When they see the profession of religion and the interests of religion ostensibly associated with what they are deeply convinced is injustice, they are led to questions about religion itself, which they see to be associated with injustice. Unbelief attracts a sympathy which it would not otherwise enjoy ; and the upshot is to impair those convictions and that religious faith, the loss of which I believe to be the most inexpressible calamity which can fall either upon a man or upon a nation.

# THE FIRST HOME RULE BILL

APRIL 8, 1886

Gladstone introduced the Home Rule Bill of 1886 in a speech which was partly historical and partly explanatory. His object was to prove that since the Act of Union in 1800 all efforts to govern Ireland through the Parliament at Westminster had failed, and to propose for that reason a system of governing her through a legislative body sitting in Dublin. He argued that Catholic Emancipation, with which Pitt intended to accompany the Act of Union, but which was postponed for nearly thirty years, had failed to reconcile the Catholics. The disestablishment of the Irish Church had put an end to the legal recognition of Protestant ascendancy. The Land Acts of 1870 and 1881 had relieved the Irish tenants of serious grievances. Subsequent Purchase Acts had created a large class of landed proprietors who were as secure in their small holdings as the wealthiest landlord. But the bulk of the Irish people were still discontented, because they had no part in the administration of their own affairs. For the greater part of the time since the Union special laws for the suppression of political and agrarian crime had been enforced in Ireland. Crime had indeed been put down with a strong hand. Discontent and disloyalty remained. How could they be met? In his opinion the only way of meeting them effectively was to entrust Irishmen with the conduct of Irish legislation and administration, so far as it did not conflict with British or Imperial interests. An Irish Legislature, with an Irish Executive responsible to it, would, he thought, be able to solve the problem of combining local autonomy with the supreme authority of Parliament over the United Kingdom. Ireland would no longer be represented at Westminster, and would pay a share of taxation, raised by her own Legislature, proportionate to her financial capacity. The powers of the Irish Legislature would be limited by the express provisions of the Act creating it, and would not extend to any matter not exclusively Irish. There would be, for instance, no right to a protective tariff, or to customs duties upon British goods at the Irish ports. The army and the navy would be unaffected. There would still be a Lord Lieutenant, responsible to the British Ministry, with control over the forces of the Crown in Ireland. Gladstone avails himself in this speech of various analogies, and in particular appeals to the Colonial Empire of Great Britain as the noblest example of Home Rule furnished by the history of the world. It was the first time on which a concrete proposal for Home Rule had been authoritatively presented to the British Parliament, and the speech treats the whole subject in an exhaustive manner.

I COULD have wished, Mr. Speaker, on several grounds, that it had been possible for me on this single occasion to open to the House the whole of the policy and intentions of the Government with respect to Ireland. The two questions of land and of

Irish government are, in our view, closely and inseparably connected, for they are the two channels through which we hope to find access, and effectual access, to that question which is the most vital of all—namely, the question of social order in Ireland. As I have said, those two questions are in our view—whatever they may be in that of any one else—they are in our view, for reasons which I cannot now explain, inseparable the one from the other. But it is impossible for me to attempt such a task. Even as it is, the mass of materials that I have before me I may, without exaggeration, call enormous. I do not know that at any period a task has been laid upon me involving so large and so diversified an exposition, and it would be in vain to attempt more than human strength can, I think, suffice to achieve. I may say that, when contemplating the magnitude of that task, I have been filled with a painful mistrust ; but that mistrust, I can assure the House, is absorbed in the yet deeper feeling of the responsibility that would lie upon me, and of the mischief that I should inflict upon the public interest, if I should fail to bring home to the minds of Members, as I seem to perceive in my own mind, the magnitude of all the varied aspects of this question. What I wish is that we should no longer fence and skirmish with this question, but that we should come to close quarters with it ; that we should get if we can at the root ; that we should take measures not merely intended for the wants of to-day and to-morrow, but, if possible, that we should look into a more distant future ; that we should endeavour to anticipate and realize that future by the force of reflection ; that we should, if possible, unroll it in anticipation before our eyes, and make provision now, while there is yet time, for all the results that may await upon a right or wrong decision of to-day.

Mr. Speaker, on one point I rejoice to think that we have a material, I would say, a vital, agreement. It is felt on both sides of the House, unless I am much mistaken, that we have arrived at a stage in our political transactions with Ireland, where two roads part one from the other, not soon probably to meet again. The late Government—I am not now referring to this as a matter of praise or blame, but simply as a matter of fact—the late Government felt that they had reached the moment for decisive resolution when they made the announcement, on the last day of their Ministerial existence, that their duty compelled them to submit to Parliament proposals for further repressive criminal legislation. We concur entirely in that conclusion, and we think that the time

is come when it is the duty of Parliament, when the honour of Parliament and its duty alike require, that it should endeavour to come to some decisive resolution in this matter ; and our intention is, Sir, to propose to the House of Commons that which, as we think, if happily accepted, will liberate Parliament from the restraints under which of late years it has ineffectually struggled to perform the Business of the country ; will restore legislation to its natural, ancient, unimpeded course ; and will, above all, obtain an answer—a clear, we hope, and definite answer—to the question whether it is or is not possible to establish good and harmonious relations between Great Britain and Ireland on the footing of those free institutions to which Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen are alike unalterably attached.

Now, when I say that we are imperatively called upon to deal with the great subject of social order in Ireland, do not let me for a moment either be led myself, or lead others, into the dangerous fault of exaggeration. The crime of Ireland, the agrarian crime of Ireland, I rejoice to say, is not what it was in other days—days now comparatively distant, days within my own earliest recollection as a Member of Parliament. In 1833 the Government of Lord Grey proposed to Parliament a strong Coercion Act. At that time the information at their command did not distinguish between agrarian and ordinary crime as the distinction is now made. As to the present time, it is easy to tell the House that the serious agrarian crimes of Ireland, which in 1881 were 1,011, in 1885 were 245. But I go back to the period of 1832. The contrast is, perhaps, still more striking. In 1832 the homicides in Ireland were 248, in 1885 they were 65. The cases of attempts to kill, happily unfulfilled, in the first of those years were 209, in 1885 were 37. The serious offences of all other kinds in Ireland in 1832 were 6,014, in 1885 they were 1,057. The whole criminal offences in Ireland in the former year were 14,000, and in the latter year 2,683.

So far, therefore, Sir, we are not to suppose that the case with which we have now to deal is one of those cases of extreme disorder which threaten the general peace of society. Notwithstanding that, Sir, in order to lay the ground for the important measure we are asking leave to introduce—and well I am aware that it does require broad and solid grounds to be laid in order to justify the introduction of such a measure—in order to lay that ground. I must ask the House to enter with me into a brief review of the general features of what has been our course with regard to what

is termed coercion, or repressive criminal legislation. And, Sir, the first point to which I would call your attention is this, that whereas exceptional legislation—legislation which introduces exceptional provisions into the law—ought itself to be in its own nature essentially and absolutely exceptional, it has become for us not exceptional, but habitual. We are like a man who, knowing that medicine may be the means of his restoration to health, endeavours to live upon medicine. Nations, no more than individuals, can find a subsistence in what was meant to be a cure. But has it been a cure? Have we attained the object which we desired, and honestly desired, to attain? No, Sir, agrarian crime has become, sometimes upon a larger and sometimes upon a smaller scale, as habitual in Ireland as the legislation which has been intended to repress it, and that agrarian crime, although at the present time it is almost at the low water-mark, yet has a fatal capacity of expansion under stimulating circumstances, and rises from time to time, as it rose in 1885, to dimensions, and to an exasperation which become threatening to general social order, and to the peace of private and domestic life. I ought, perhaps, to supply an element, which I forgot at the moment, in comparing 1832 and 1885—that is to remind the House that the decrease of crime is not so great as it looks, because the population of Ireland at that time was nearly 8,000,000, whereas it may be taken at present at 5,000,000. But the exact proportion, I believe, is fairly represented by the figure I will now give. The population of Ireland now, compared with that time, is under two-thirds; the crime of Ireland now, as compared with that period, is under one-fifth.

But the agrarian crime in Ireland is not so much a cause as it is a symptom. It is a symptom of a yet deeper mischief of which it is only the external manifestation. That manifestation is mainly threefold. In the first place, with certain exceptions for the case of winter juries, it is impossible to depend in Ireland upon the finding of a jury in a case of agrarian crime according to the facts as they are viewed by the Government, by the Judges, and by the public, I think, at large. That is a most serious mischief, passing down deep into the very groundwork of civil society. It is also, Sir, undoubtedly a mischief that, in cases where the extreme remedy of eviction is resorted to by the landlord—possibly, in some cases, unnecessarily resorted to, but, in other instances, resorted to after long patience has been exhausted—these cases of eviction, good, bad, and indifferent as to their

justification, stand pretty much in one and the same discredit with the rural population of Ireland, and become, as we know, the occasion of transactions that we all deeply lament. Finally, Sir, it is not to be denied that there is great interference in Ireland with individual liberty in the shape of intimidation. Now, Sir, I am not about to assume the tone of the Pharisee on this occasion. There is a great deal of intimidation in England, too, when people find occasion for it ; and if we, the English and the Scotch, were under the conviction that we had such grave cause to warrant irregular action, as is the conviction entertained by a very large part of the population in Ireland, I am not at all sure that we should not, like that part of the population in Ireland, resort to the rude and unjustifiable remedy of intimidation. I am very ambitious on this important and critical occasion to gain one object—that is, not to treat this question controversially. I have this object in view, and I do not despair of attaining it ; and in order that I may do nothing to cause me to fail of attaining it, I will not enter into the question, if you like, whether there ever is intimidation in England or not. But I will simply record the fact, which I thought it best just to accompany with a confession with regard to ourselves—I will simply record the fact that intimidation does prevail, not to the extent that is supposed, yet to a material and painful extent in Ireland. The consequence of that is to weaken generally the respect for law, and the respect for contract, and that among a people who, I believe, are as capable of attaining to the very highest moral and social standard as any people on the face of the earth. So much for coercion—if I use the phrase it is for brevity for repressive legislation generally—but there is one circumstance to which I cannot help calling the special attention of the House.

Nothing has been more painful to me than to observe that, in this matter, we are not improving, but, on the contrary, we are losing ground. Since the last half-century dawned, we have been steadily engaged in extending, as well as in consolidating, free institutions. I divide the period since the Act of Union with Ireland into two—the first from 1800 to 1832, the epoch of what is still justly called the great Reform Act ; and, secondly, from 1833 to 1885. I do not know whether it has been as widely observed as I think it deserves to be that, in the first of those periods—thirty-two years—there were no less than eleven years—it may seem not much to say, but wait for what is coming—there were no less than eleven of those thirty-two years in which our Statute Book was

free throughout the whole year from repressive legislation of an exceptional kind against Ireland. But in the fifty-three years since we advanced far in the career of Liberal principles and actions—in those fifty-three years from 1833 to 1885—there were but two years which were entirely free from the action of this special legislation for Ireland. Is not that of itself almost enough to prove that we have arrived at the point where it is necessary that we should take a careful and searching survey of our position? For, Sir, I would almost venture, trusting to the indulgent interpretation of the House, to say that the coercion we have heretofore employed has been spurious and ineffectual coercion, and that if there is to be coercion—which God forbid—it ought to be adequate to attain its end. If it is to attain its end it must be different, differently maintained, and maintained with a different spirit, courage, and consistency compared with the coercion with which we have been heretofore familiar.

Well, Sir, what are the results that have been produced? This result above all—and now I come to what I consider to be the basis of the whole mischief—that rightly or wrongly, yet in point of fact, law is discredited in Ireland, and discredited in Ireland upon this ground especially—that it comes to the people of that country with a foreign aspect, and in a foreign garb. These Coercion Bills of ours, of course—for it has become a matter of course—I am speaking of the facts and not of the merits—these Coercion Bills are stiffly resisted by the Members who represent Ireland in Parliament. The English mind, by cases of this kind and by the tone of the Press towards them, is estranged from the Irish people and the Irish mind is estranged from the people of England and Scotland. I will not speak of other circumstances attending the present state of Ireland, but I do think that I am not assuming too much when I say that I have shown enough in this comparatively brief review—and I wish it could have been briefer still—to prove that, if coercion is to be the basis for legislation, we must no longer be seeking, as we are always laudably seeking, to whittle it down almost to nothing at the very first moment we begin, but we must, like men, adopt it, hold by it, sternly enforce it, till its end has been completely attained—with what results to peace, good will, and freedom I do not now stop to inquire. Our ineffectual and spurious coercion is morally worn out. I give credit to the late Government for their conception of the fact. They must have realized it when they came to the conclusion, in 1885, that they

would not propose the renewal or continuance of repressive legislation. They were in a position in which it would have been comparatively easy for them to have proposed it, as a Conservative Government, following in the footsteps of a Liberal Administration. But they determined not to propose it. I wish I could be assured that they and the Party by whom they are supported, were fully aware of the immense historic weight of that determination. I have sometimes heard language used which appears to betoken an idea, on the part of those who use it, that this is a very simple matter—that in one state of facts they judged one way in July, and that in another state of facts they judged another way in January; and that, consequently, the whole ought to be effaced from the minds and memories of men. Depend upon it the effect of that decision of July never can be effaced—it will weigh, it will tell upon the fortunes and circumstances both of England and of Ireland. The return to the ordinary law, I am afraid, cannot be said to have succeeded.

Almost immediately after the lapse of the Crimes Act “Boy-cotting” increased fourfold. Since that time it has been about stationary; but in October it had increased fourfold, compared with what it was in the month of May. Well, now, if it be true that resolute coercion ought to take the place of irresolute coercion—if it be true that our system, such as I have exhibited it, has been—we may hide it from ourselves, we cannot hide it from the world—a failure in regard to repressive legislation, will that other coercion, which it is possible to conceive, be more successful? I can, indeed, conceive and in history we may point to circumstances in which coercion of that kind, stern, resolute, consistent, might be, and has been, successful. But it requires, in my judgment, two essential conditions, and these are—the autocracy of Government, and the secrecy of public transactions. With those conditions, that kind of coercion to which I am referring might possibly succeed. But will it succeed in the light of day, and can it be administered by the people of England and Scotland against the people of Ireland by the two nations which, perhaps, above all others upon earth—I need hardly except America—best understand and are most fondly attached to the essential principles of liberty?

Now, I enter upon another proposition to which I hardly expect broad exception can be taken. I will not assume, I will not beg, the question, whether the people of England and Scotland will ever administer that sort of effectual coercion which I have

placed in contrast with our timid and hesitating repressive measures ; but this I will say, that the people of England and Scotland will never resort to that alternative until they have tried every other. Have they tried every other ? Well, some we have tried, to which I will refer. I have been concerned with some of them myself. But we have not yet tried every alternative, because there is one—not unknown to human experience—on the contrary, widely known to various countries in the world where this dark and difficult problem has been solved by the comparatively natural and simple, though not always easy, expedient of stripping law of its foreign garb, and investing it with a domestic character. I am not saying that this will succeed ; I by no means beg the question at this moment ; but this I will say, that Ireland, as far as I know, and speaking of the great majority of the people of Ireland, believes it will succeed, and that experience elsewhere supports that conclusion. The case of Ireland, though she is represented here not less fully than England or Scotland, is not the same as that of England or Scotland. England, by her own strength, and by her vast majority in this House, makes her own laws just as independently as if she were not combined with two other countries. Scotland—a small country, smaller than Ireland, but a country endowed with a spirit so masculine that never in the long course of history, excepting for two brief periods, each of a few years, was the superior strength of England such as to enable her to put down the national freedom beyond the border—Scotland, wisely recognized by England, has been allowed and encouraged in this House to make her own laws as freely and as effectually as if she had a representation six times as strong. The consequence is that the mainspring of law in England is felt by the people to be English ; the mainspring of law in Scotland is felt by the people to be Scotch ; but the mainspring of law in Ireland is not felt by the people to be Irish, and I am bound to say—truth extorts from me the avowal—that it cannot be felt to be Irish in the same sense as it is English and Scotch. The net results of this statement which I have laid before the House, because it was necessary as the groundwork of my argument, are these—in the first place, I admit it to be little less than a mockery to hold that the state of law and of facts conjointly, which I have endeavoured to describe, conduces to the real unity of this great, noble, and world-wide Empire. In the second place, something must be done, something is imperatively demanded from us to restore to Ireland the first conditions of civil life—the free course

of law, the liberty of every individual in the exercise of every legal right, the confidence of the people in the law, and their sympathy with the law, apart from which no country can be called, in the full sense of the word, a civilized country, nor can there be given to that country the blessings which it is the object of civilized society to attain. Well, this is my introduction to the task I have to perform, and now I ask attention to the problem we have before us.

It is a problem not unknown in the history of the world ; it is really this—there can be no secret about it as far as we are concerned—how to reconcile Imperial unity with diversity of legislation. Mr. Grattan not only held these purposes to be reconcilable, but he did not scruple to go the length of saying this—

“ I demand the continued severance of the Parliaments with a view to the continued and everlasting unity of the Empire.”

Was that a flight of rhetoric, an audacious paradox ? No ; it was the statement of a problem which other countries have solved, and under circumstances much more difficult than ours. We ourselves may be said to have solved it, for I do not think that any one will question the fact that, out of the six last centuries, for five centuries at least Ireland has had a Parliament separate from ours. That is a fact undeniable. Did that separation of Parliament destroy the unity of the British Empire ? Did it destroy it in the eighteenth century ? Do not suppose that I mean that harmony always prevailed between Ireland and England. We know very well there were causes quite sufficient to account for a recurrence of discord. But I take the eighteenth century alone. Can I be told that there was no unity of Empire in the eighteenth century ? Why, Sir, it was the century which saw our Navy come to its supremacy. It was the century which witnessed the foundation of that great, gigantic manufacturing industry which now overshadows the whole world. It was, in a pre-eminent sense, the century of Empire, and it was in a sense, but too conspicuous, the century of wars. Those wars were carried on, that Empire was maintained and enormously enlarged, that trade was established, that Navy was brought to supremacy when England and Ireland had separate Parliaments. Am I to be told that there was no unity of Empire in that state of things ? Well, Sir, what has happened elsewhere ? Have any other countries had to look this problem in the face ? The last half-century—the last sixty or seventy years since the great war—has

been particularly rich in its experience of this subject and in the lessons which it has afforded to us. There are many cases to which I might refer to show how practicable it is, or how practicable it has been found by others whom we are not accustomed to look upon as our political superiors—how practicable it has been found by others to bring into existence what is termed local autonomy, and yet not to sacrifice, but to confirm Imperial unity.

Let us look to those two countries, neither of them very large, but yet countries which every Englishman and every Scotchman must rejoice to claim his kin—I mean the Scandinavian countries of Sweden and Norway. Immediately after the great war the Norwegians were ready to take sword in hand to prevent their coming under the domination of Sweden. But the Powers of Europe undertook the settlement of that question, and they united those countries upon a footing of strict legislative independence and co-equality. Now, I am not quoting this as an exact precedent for us, but I am quoting it as a precedent, and as an argument *à fortiori*, because I say they confronted much greater difficulties, and they had to put a far greater strain upon the unity of their country, than we can ever be called upon to put upon the unity of ours. The Legislatures of Sweden and of Norway are absolutely independent. The law even forbids—what I hope never will happen between England and Ireland—that a Swede, if I am correct in my impression, should bear office of any kind in the Norwegian Ministry. There is no sort of supremacy or superiority in the Legislature of Sweden over the Legislature of Norway. The Legislature of Norway has had serious controversies, not with Sweden, but with the King of Sweden, and it has fought out those controversies successfully upon the strictest Constitutional and Parliamentary grounds. And yet with two countries so united, what has been the effect? Not discord, not convulsions, not danger to peace, not hatred, not aversion, but a constantly growing sympathy; and every man who knows their condition knows that I speak the truth when I say that, in every year that passes, the Norwegians and the Swedes are more and more feeling themselves to be the children of a common country, united by a tie which never is to be broken.

I will take another case—the case of Austria and Hungary. In Austria and Hungary there is a complete duality of power. I will not enter upon the general condition of the Austrian Empire, or upon the other divisions and diversities which it includes, but I will take simply this case. At Vienna sits the Parliament of the

Austrian Monarchy ; at Buda-Pesth sits the Parliament of the Hungarian Crown ; and that is the state of things which was established, I think, nearly twenty years ago. I ask all those who hear me whether there is one among them who doubts ? Whether or not the condition of Austria be at this moment, or be not, perfectly solid, secure, and harmonious, after the enormous difficulties she has had to confront, on account of the boundless diversity of race, whether or not that condition be perfectly normal in every minute particular, this, at least, cannot be questioned, that it is a condition of solidity and of safety compared with the time when Hungary made war on her—war which she was unable to quell when she owed the cohesion of the body politic to the interference of Russian arms ; or in the interval that followed, when there existed a perfect Legislative Union and a supreme Imperial Council sat in Vienna ?

Now, I have quoted these illustrations as illustrations which show, not that what we are called upon to consider can be done, but that infinitely more can be done—has been done—under circumstances far less favourable. What was the state of Sweden and Norway—two small countries, Norway undoubtedly inferior in population, but still unassailable in her mountain fastnesses—what was the case of Sweden and Norway for bringing about a union by physical and material means ? There were no means to be used but moral means, and those moral means have been completely successful. What, again, was the case of Austria, where the seat of Empire in the Archduchy was associated not with the majority, but with a minority of the population, and where she had to face Hungary with numbers far greater than her own ? Even there, while having to attempt what was infinitely more complex and more dangerous than even prejudice can suppose to be that which I am about to suggest, it is not to be denied that a great relative good and relative success have been attained. Our advantages are immense in a question of this kind. I do not know how many gentlemen who hear me have read the valuable work of Professor Dicey on the Law of the Constitution. No work that I have ever read brings out in a more distinct and emphatic manner the peculiarity of the British Constitution in one point to which, perhaps, we seldom have occasion to refer—namely, the absolute supremacy of Parliament. We have a Parliament to the power of which there are no limits whatever, except such as human nature in a Divinely-ordained condition of things imposes. We are faced by no co-ordinate

Legislatures, and are bound by no statutory conditions. There is nothing that controls us, and nothing that compels us, except our convictions of law, of right, and of justice. Surely that is a favourable point of departure in considering a question such as this.

I have referred to the eighteenth century. During that century you had beside you a co-ordinate Legislature. The Legislature of Ireland, before the Union, had the same title as that of Great Britain. There was no juridical distinction to be drawn between them. Even in point of antiquity they were as nearly as possible on a par, for the Parliament of Ireland had subsisted for 500 years. It had asserted its exclusive right to make laws for the people of Ireland. That right was never denied, for gentlemen ought to recollect, but all do not, perhaps, remember, that Poyning's Law was an Irish law imposed by Ireland on herself. That claim of the Parliament of Ireland never was denied until the Reign of George II, and that claim, denied in the Reign of George II, was admitted in the Reign of George III. The Parliament—the great Parliament of Great Britain—had to retract its words, and to withdraw its claim, and the Legislature which goes by the name of Grattan's Parliament was as independent in point of authority as any Legislature over the whole world. We are not called upon to constitute another co-ordinate Legislature. While I think it is right to modify the Union in some particulars, we are not about to propose its repeal.

What is the essence of the Union? That is the question. It is impossible to determine what is and what is not the repeal of the Union, until you settle what is the essence of the Union. Well, I define the essence of the Union to be this—that before the Act of Union there were two independent, separate, co-ordinate Parliaments; after the Act of Union there was but one. A supreme statutory authority of the Imperial Parliament over Great Britain, Scotland, and Ireland as one United Kingdom was established by the Act of Union. That supreme statutory authority it is not asked, so far as I am aware, and certainly it is not intended, in the slightest degree to impair. When I heard the hon. Member for the City of Cork,<sup>1</sup> in a very striking speech at the commencement of the Session, ask for what I think he termed local autonomy or Irish autonomy, I felt that something was gained in the conduct of this great question. If he speaks, as I believe he speaks, the mind of the vast majority of the Repre-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Parnell.

sentatives of Ireland, I feel that we have no right to question for a moment, in this free country, under a representative system, that the vast majority of the Representatives speak the mind of a decided majority of the people. I felt, Sir, that something had been gained. Ireland had come a great way to meet us, and it was more than ever our duty to consider whether we could not go some way to meet her. The term "Dismemberment of the Empire," as applied to anything that is now before us, is, in my judgment—I will not argue it at any length now—simply a misnomer. To speak, in any meditated or possible plan, of the dismemberment of the Empire is, in the face of the history of the eighteenth century, not merely a misnomer, but an absurdity. Some phrases have been used which I will not refer to, simply because I do not think that they quite accurately describe the case, and because they might open the door to new debate. We hear of national independence, we hear of legislative independence, we hear of an independent Parliament, and we hear of Federal arrangements. These are not descriptions which I adopt, or which I find it necessary to discuss.

Then, again, under a sense of the real necessities of the case, there are gentlemen who have their own philanthropic, well-intended plans for meeting this emergency. There are those who say—"Let us abolish the Castle"; and I think that gentlemen of very high authority, who are strongly opposed to giving Ireland a domestic Legislature, have said nevertheless that they think there ought to be a general reconstruction of the administrative Government in Ireland. Well, Sir, I have considered that question much, and what I want to know is this—how, without a change in the Legislature, without giving to Ireland a domestic Legislature, there is to be, or there even can possibly be, a reconstruction of the Administration? We have sent to Ireland, to administer the actual system, the best man we could find. When Lord Spencer undertook that Office, he represented, not in our belief merely, but in our knowledge—for we had known him long—the flower of the British aristocracy, that portion of the British aristocracy which, to high birth and great influence of station, unites a love of liberty and of the people, as genuine as that which breathes within any cottage in the land. And yet, Sir, what is the result? The result is that, after a life of almost unexampled devotion to the Public Service in Ireland, Lord Spencer's Administration not only does not command, which is easily understood, the adhesion and the commendation of the hon. Member for the

City of Cork <sup>1</sup> and his colleagues, but it is made the subject of cavil and of censure in this House of Parliament, and from the spot where I now stand, by Members of the late Conservative Government. I want to know—for we have not come to our conclusions without making careful examination of the conclusions of other people—I want to know how it is possible to construct an administrative system in Ireland without legislative change, and what gentlemen mean when they speak of the administrative system of Ireland? The fault of the administrative system of Ireland, if it has a fault, is simply this—that its spring and source of action, or, if I can use an anatomical illustration without a blunder, what is called the motor muscle is English and not Irish. Without providing a domestic Legislature for Ireland, without having an Irish Parliament, I want to know how you will bring about this wonderful superhuman, and, I believe, in this condition, impossible result, that your administrative system shall be Irish, and not English?

There have been several plans liberally devised for granting to Ireland the management of her education, the management of her public works, and the management of one subject and another—boons very important in themselves—under a Central Elective Body; boons, any of which I do not hesitate to say I should have been glad to see accepted, or I should have been glad to see a trial given to a system which might have been constructed under them, had it been the desire and the demand of Ireland. I do not think such a scheme would have possessed the advantage of finality. If it had been accepted, and especially if it had been freely suggested from that quarter—by the Irish Representatives—it might have furnished a useful *modus vivendi*. But it is absurd, in my opinion, to talk of the adoption of such a scheme in the face of two obstacles—first of all, that those whom it is intended to benefit do not want it, do not ask it, and refuse it; and, secondly, the obstacle, not less important, that all those who are fearful of giving a domestic Legislature to Ireland would naturally, emphatically, and rather justly, say—“We will not create your Central Board and palter with this question, because we feel certain that it will afford nothing in this world except a stage from which to agitate for a further concession, and because we see that by the proposal you make you will not even attain the advantage of settling the question that is raised.”

Well, Sir, what we seek is the settlement of that question, and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Parnell.

we think that we find that settlement in the establishment, by the authority of Parliament, of a Legislative Body sitting in Dublin, for the conduct of both legislation and administration under the conditions which may be prescribed by the Act defining Irish, as distinct from Imperial, affairs. There is the head and front of our offending. Let us proceed to examine the matter a little further. The essential conditions of any plan that Parliament can be asked or could be expected to entertain are, in my opinion, these :—The unity of the Empire must not be placed in jeopardy ; the safety and welfare of the whole—if there is an unfortunate conflict, which I do not believe—the welfare and security of the whole must be preferred to the security and advantage of the part. The political equality of the three countries must be maintained. They stand by statute on a footing of absolute equality, and that footing ought not to be altered or brought into question. There should be what I will at present term an equitable distribution of Imperial burdens.

Next I introduce a provision which may seem to be exceptional, but which, in the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, whose history unhappily has been one long chain of internal controversies as well as of external difficulties, is necessary in order that there may be reasonable safeguards for the minority. I am asked why there should be safeguards for the minority. Will not the minority in Ireland, as in other countries, be able to take care of itself ? Are not free institutions, with absolute publicity, the best security that can be given to any minority ? I know, Sir, that in the long run our experience shows they are. After we have passed through the present critical period, and obviated and disarmed, if we can, the jealousies with which any change is attended, I believe, as most gentlemen in this House may probably believe, that there is nothing comparable to the healthy action of free discussion, and that a minority asserting in the face of day its natural rights is the best security and guarantee for its retaining them. We have not reached that state of things. I may say, not entering into detail, there are three classes to whom we must look in this case. We must consider—I will not say more on that subject to-day—the class immediately connected with the lard. A second question, not, I think, offering any great difficulty, relates to the Civil Service and the offices of the Executive Government in Ireland. The third question relates to what is commonly called the Protestant minority, and especially that important part of the community which inhabits the Province

of Ulster, or which predominates in a considerable portion of the Province of Ulster.

I will deviate from my path for a moment to say a word upon the state of opinion in that wealthy, intelligent, and energetic portion of the Irish community which, as I have said, predominates in a certain portion of Ulster. Our duty is to adhere to sound general principles, and to give the utmost consideration we can to the opinions of that energetic minority. The first thing of all, I should say, is that if, upon any occasion, by any individual or section, violent measures have been threatened in certain emergencies, I think the best compliment I can pay to those who have threatened us is to take no notice whatever of the threats, but to treat them as momentary ebullitions, which will pass away with the fears from which they spring, and at the same time to adopt on our part every reasonable measure for disarming those fears. I cannot conceal the conviction that the voice of Ireland, as a whole, is at this moment clearly and Constitutionally spoken. I cannot say it is otherwise when five-sixths of its lawfully-chosen Representatives are of one mind in this matter. There is a counter voice ; and I wish to know what is the claim of those by whom that counter voice is spoken, and how much is the scope and allowance we can give them. Certainly, Sir, I cannot allow it to be said that a Protestant minority in Ulster, or elsewhere, is to rule the question at large for Ireland. I am aware of no Constitutional doctrine tolerable on which such a conclusion could be adopted or justified. But I think that the Protestant minority should have its wishes considered to the utmost practicable extent in any form which they may assume.

Various schemes, short of refusing the demand of Ireland at large, have been proposed on behalf of Ulster. One scheme is, that Ulster itself, or, perhaps with more appearance of reason, a portion of Ulster, should be excluded from the operations of the Bill we are about to introduce. Another scheme is, that a separate autonomy should be provided for Ulster, or for a portion of Ulster. Another scheme is that certain rights with regard to certain subjects—such, for example, as education and some other subjects—should be reserved and should be placed, to a certain extent, under the control of Provincial Councils. These, I think, are the suggestions which have reached me in different shapes ; there may be others. But what I wish to say of them is this—there is no one of them which has appeared to us to be so completely justified, either upon its merits or by the weight of opinion

supporting and recommending it, as to warrant our including it in the Bill and proposing it to Parliament upon our responsibility. What we think is that such suggestions deserve careful and unprejudiced consideration. It may be that free discussion, which I have no doubt will largely take place after a Bill such as we propose shall have been laid on the Table of the House, may give to one of these proposals, or to some other proposals, a practicable form, and that some such plan may be found to be recommended by a general or predominating approval. If it should be so, it will, at our hands, have the most favourable consideration, with every disposition to do what equity may appear to recommend. That is what I have to say on the subject of Ulster.

I have spoken now of the essential conditions of a good plan for Ireland, and I add only this—that, in order to be a good plan, it must be a plan promising to be a real settlement of Ireland. To show that, without a good plan, you can have no real settlement, I may point to the fact that the great settlement of 1782 was not a real settlement. Most unhappily, Sir, it was not a real settlement; and why was it not a real settlement? Was it Ireland that prevented it from being a real settlement? No, Sir, it was the mistaken policy of England listening to the pernicious voice and claims of ascendancy. It is impossible, however, not to say this word for the Protestant Parliament of Ireland. Founded as it was upon narrow suffrage, exclusive in religion, crowded with pensioners and place-holders, holding every advantage, it yet had in it the spark, at least, and the spirit of true patriotism. It emancipated the Roman Catholics of Ireland when the Roman Catholics of England were not yet emancipated. It received Lord Fitzwilliam with open arms; and when Lord Fitzwilliam promoted to the best of his ability the introduction of Roman Catholics into Parliament, and when his brief career was unhappily intercepted by a peremptory recall from England, what happened? Why, Sir, in both Houses of the Irish Parliament votes were at once passed by those Protestants, by those men, mixed, as they were, with so large an infusion of pensioners and place men, registering their confidence in that Nobleman, and desiring that he should still be left to administer the government of Ireland. What the Irish Parliament did when Lord Fitzwilliam was promoting the admission of Roman Catholics into Parliament justifies me in saying there was a spirit there which, if free scope had been left to it, would in all probability have been enabled to work out a happy solution for every Irish

problem and difficulty, and would have saved to the coming generation an infinity of controversy and trouble.

I pass on to ask how are we to set about the giving effect to the proposition I have made, to the purpose I have defined, of establishing in Ireland a domestic Legislature to deal with Irish as contradistinguished from Imperial affairs? And here, Sir, I am confronted at the outset by what we have felt to be a formidable dilemma. I will endeavour to state and to explain it to the House as well as I can. Ireland is to have a domestic Legislature for Irish affairs. That is my postulate from which I set out. Are Irish Members in this House, are Irish Representative Peers in the other House, still to continue to form part of the respective Assemblies? That is the first question which meets us in consideration of the ground I have opened. Now I think it will be perfectly clear that, if Ireland is to have a domestic Legislature, Irish Peers and Irish Representatives cannot come here to control English and Scotch affairs. That I understand to be admitted freely. I never heard of their urging the contrary, and I am inclined to believe that it would be universally admitted. The one thing follows from the other. There cannot be a domestic Legislature in Ireland, dealing with Irish affairs, and Irish Peers and Irish Representatives sitting in Parliament at Westminster to take part in English and Scotch affairs. My next question is—Is it practicable for Irish Representatives to come here for the settlement, not of English or Scotch, but of Imperial affairs? In principle it would be very difficult, I think, to object to that proposition. But then its acceptance depends entirely upon our arriving at the conclusion that, in this House, we can draw for practical purposes a distinction between affairs which are Imperial, and affairs which are not Imperial. It would not be difficult to say in principle that, as the Irish Legislature will have nothing to do with Imperial concerns, let Irish Members come here and vote on Imperial concerns. All depends on the practicability of the distinction. Well, Sir, I have thought much, reasoned much, and inquired much with regard to that distinction. I had hoped it might be possible to draw a distinction, and I have arrived at the conclusion that it cannot be drawn. I believe it passes the wit of man; at any rate, it passes not my wit alone, but the wit of many with whom I have communicated. It would be easy to exhibit a case; but the difficulty, I may say, in my opinion arises from this. If this were a merely Legislative House, or if the House of Lords were merely a Legislative House—this House, of

course, affords the best illustration—I do not think it would be difficult to draw a distinction. We are going to draw the distinction—we have drawn the distinction—in the Bill which I ask leave to lay on the Table for legislative purposes with reference to what I hope will be the domestic Legislature of Ireland. But this House is not merely a Legislative House ; it is a House controlling the Executive ; and when you come to the control of the Executive, then your distinction between Imperial subjects and non-Imperial subjects totally breaks down—they are totally insufficient to cover the whole case.

For example, suppose it to be a question of foreign policy. Suppose the Irish Members in this House coming here to vote on a question of foreign policy. Is it possible to deny that they would be entitled to take part in discussing an Address to the Crown for the dismissal of the Foreign Minister ? It is totally impossible to deny—it is totally impossible to separate—the right of impugning the policy and the right of action against the Minister. Well, Sir, if on that account, Members might take part in an Address dismissing the Foreign Minister, I want to know, considering the collective responsibility of Government—a principle, I hope, which will always be maintained at the very highest level that circumstances will permit, for I am satisfied that the public honour and the public welfare are closely associated with it—if that be so, what will be the effect of the dismissal of the Foreign Minister on the existence and action of the Government to which he belongs ? Why, Sir, the Government in nineteen cases out of twenty will break down with the Foreign Minister ; and when these gentlemen, coming here for the purpose of discussing Imperial questions alone, could dislodge the Government which is charged with the entire interests of England and Scotland, I ask you what becomes of the distinction between Imperial and non-Imperial affairs ? I believe the distinction to be impossible, and therefore I arrive at the next conclusion—that Irish Members and Irish Peers cannot, if a domestic Legislature be given to Ireland, justly retain a seat in the Parliament at Westminster.

If Irish Members do not sit in this House and Irish Peers do not sit in the other House, how is Ireland to be taxed ? I shall assume as a matter of course, that we should propose that a general power of taxation should pass to the domestic Legislature of Ireland. But there is one very important branch of taxation, involving, indeed, a second branch, which is susceptible of being viewed in a very different aspect from the taxes of Ireland gener-

ally. I mean the duties of Customs and duties of Excise relatively to Customs. One thing I take to be absolutely certain. Great Britain will never force upon Ireland taxation without representation. Well, Sir, if we are never to force upon Ireland taxation without representation, then comes another question of the deepest practical interest—Are we to give up the fiscal unity of the Empire? I sometimes see it argued that, in giving up the fiscal unity of the Empire, we should give up the unity of the Empire. To that argument I do not subscribe. The unity of the Empire rests upon the supremacy of Parliament, and on considerations much higher than considerations merely fiscal. But I must admit that, while I cannot stand on the high ground of principle, yet, on the very substantial ground of practice, to give up the fiscal unity of the Empire would be a great public inconvenience, and a very great public misfortune—a very great public misfortune for Great Britain; and I believe it would be a still greater misfortune for Ireland were the fiscal unity of the Empire to be put to hazard and practically abandoned. I may say also, looking as I do with hope to the success of the measure I now propose, I, at any rate, feel the highest obligation not to do anything, not to propose anything, without necessity, that would greatly endanger the right comprehension of this subject by the people of England and Scotland, which might be the case were the fiscal unity of the Empire to be broken.

There is the dilemma. I conceive that there is but one escape from it, and that is, if there were conditions upon which Ireland consented to such arrangements as would leave the authority of levying Customs duties and such Excise duties as are immediately connected with Customs in the hands of Parliament here, and would, by her will, consent to set our hands free to take the course that the general exigencies of the case appear to require. These conditions I take to be three:—In the first place, that a general power of taxation over and above these particular duties should pass unequivocally into the hands of the domestic Legislature of Ireland. In the second place, that the entire proceeds of the Customs and Excise should be held for the benefit of Ireland, for the discharge of the obligations of Ireland, and for the payment of the balance, after discharging these obligations, into an Irish Exchequer, to remain at the free disposal of the Irish Legislative Body.

But there is another point which I think ought to engage, and may justly engage, the anxious attention in particular of the

Representatives of Ireland ; and it is this :—The proposal which I have now sketched is that we should pass an Act giving to Ireland what she considers an enormous boon, under the name of a statutory Parliament for the control of Irish affairs, both legislative and administrative. But one of the provisions of that Act is the withdrawal of Irish Representative Peers from the House of Lords, and Irish Members from the House of Commons. Well, then, I think it will naturally occur to the Irish, as it would in parallel circumstances to the Scotch or the English—and more especially to the Scotch—mind, what would become of the privileges conveyed by the Act after the Scotch Members, who were their natural guardians, were withdrawn from Parliament ? (AN HON. MEMBER : The Irish Members.) I was speaking of the Scotch Members in order to bring it very distinctly to the minds of hon. Members, supposing Scotland had entertained—what she has never had reason to entertain—the desire for a domestic Legislature. I must confess I think that Ireland ought to have security on that subject—security that advantage would not be taken, so far as we can preclude the possibility of it, of the absence of Irish Representatives from Parliament, for the purpose of tampering with any portion of the boon which we propose to confer on Ireland by this Act. I think we have found a method for dealing with that difficulty. I may be very sanguine, but I hope that the day may come when Ireland would have reason to look on this Act, if adopted by Parliament, as for practical purposes her Magna Charta. A Magna Charta for Ireland ought to be most jealously and effectively assured, and it will be assured, against unhallowed and unlawful interference.

Two cases at once occur to the mind. There might be alterations of detail in a law of this kind on which everybody might be agreed. We think it would be very absurd to require either the construction or reconstruction of a cumbrous and difficult machinery for the purpose of disposing of cases of this kind, and therefore we propose that the provisions of this Act might be modified with the concurrence of the Irish Legislature, or in conformity with an Address from the Irish Legislature. That is intended for cases where there is a general agreement. I hope it will not happen, but I admit it might happen, that in some point or other the foresight and sagacity now brought to bear on this subject might prove insufficient. It is possible, though I trust it is not probable, that material alterations might be found requisite, that on these Amendments there might be differences of opinion ; and yet,

however improbable the case may be, it is a case which it might be proper to provide for beforehand. What we then should propose is that the provisions of this Act should not be altered, except either on an Address from the Irish Legislature to the Crown such as I have described, or else, after replacing and recalling into action the full machinery under which Irish Representatives now sit here, and Irish Peers sit in the House of Lords, so that, when their case again came to be tried, they might have the very same means of defending their Constitutional rights as they have now. Now, we believe that is one of those cases which are often best averted by making a good provision against them.

Now, upon the footing which I have endeavoured to describe we propose to relieve Irish Peers and Representatives from attendance at Westminster, and at the same time to preserve absolutely the fiscal unity of the Empire. Let me say that there are several reasons that occur to me which might well incline the prudence of Irishmen to adopt an arrangement of this kind. If there were Irish Representatives in this House at the same time that a domestic Legislature sat in Ireland, I think that the presence of those Irish Representatives would have some tendency to disparage the domestic Legislature. I think there would be serious difficulties that would arise besides the insurmountable difficulty that I have pointed out as to the division of subjects. Even if it were possible to divide the subjects, what an anomaly it would be, what a mutilation of all our elementary ideas about the absolute equality of Members in this House, were we to have ordinarily among us two classes of Members, one of them qualified to vote on all kinds of Business, and another qualified only to vote here and there on particular kinds of Business, and obliged to submit to some criterion or other—say, the authority of the Chair—novel for such a purpose, and difficult to exercise—in order to determine what kinds of Business they could vote upon, and what kinds of Business they must abstain from voting on! There would, I think, be another difficulty in determining what the number of those Members should be. My opinion is that there would be great jealousy of the habitual presence of 103 Irish Members in this House, even for limited purposes, after a Legislative Body had been constructed in Ireland; and, on the other hand, I can very well conceive that Ireland would exceedingly object to the reduction—the material reduction—of those Members. I am sorry to have to mention another difficulty, which is this—Ireland has not had the practice in local self-government

that has been given to England and Scotland. We have, unfortunately, shut her out from that experience. In some respects we have been jealous, in others niggardly, towards Ireland. It might be very difficult for Ireland, in the present state of things, to man a Legislative Chamber in Dublin, and at the same time to present in this House an array of so much distinguished ability as, I think, all Parties will admit has been exhibited on the part of Ireland during recent Parliaments on the Benches of this House.

But I pass on from this portion of the question, having referred to these two initiatory propositions as principal parts of the foundation of the Bill—namely, first that it is proposed that the Irish Representation in Parliament at Westminster should cease, unless in the contingent and I hope hardly possible, case to which I have alluded ; and, next, that the fiscal unity of the Empire shall be absolutely maintained. My next duty is to state what the powers of the proposed Legislative Body will be.

The capital article of that Legislative Body will be that it should have the control of the Executive Government of Ireland as well as of legislative Business. Evidently, I think, it was a flaw in the system of 1782 that adequate provision was not made for that purpose ; and we should not like to leave a flaw of such a nature in the work we are now undertaking. In 1782 there were difficulties that we have not now before us. At that time it might have been very fairly said that no one could tell how a separate Legislature would work unless it had under its control what is termed a responsible Government. We have no such difficulty and no such excuse now. The problem of responsible Government has been solved for us in our Colonies. It works very well there ; and in, perhaps, a dozen cases in different quarters of the globe it works to our perfect satisfaction. It may be interesting to the House if I recount the fact that that responsible Government in the Colonies was, I think, first established by one of our most distinguished statesmen, Earl Russell, when he held the Office of Colonial Secretary in the Government of Lord Melbourne. But it was a complete departure from established tradition ; and, if I remember right, not more than two or three years before that generous and wise experiment was tried, Lord Russell had himself written a most able despatch to show that it could not be done ; that with responsible Government in the Colonies you would have two centres of gravity and two sources of motion in the Empire ; while a United Empire absolutely

required that there should be but one, and that consequently the proposition could not be entertained. Such was the view of the question while it was yet at a distance ; and such, perhaps, may have been our view on the subject I am now discussing while it was yet at a distance. But it has been brought near to us by the circumstances of the late Election ; and I believe that if we look closely at its particulars we should find that many of the fears with which we may have regarded it are perfectly unreal, and especially so that great panic, that great apprehension of all, the fear lest it should prove injurious to what it is our first duty to maintain—namely, the absolute unity and integrity of the Empire.

There is another point, in regard to the powers of the Legislative Body, of which I wish to make specific mention. Two courses might have been followed. One would be to endow this Legislative Body with particular legislative powers. The other is to except from the sphere of its action those subjects which we think ought to be excepted, and to leave it everything else which is the consequence of the plans before us. There will be an enumeration of disabilities, and everything not included in that enumeration will be left open to the domestic Legislature. As I have already said, the administrative power by a responsible Government would pass under our proposals with the legislative power. Then, Sir, the Legislative Body would be subject to the provisions of the Act, in the first place, as to its own composition. But we propose to introduce into it what I would generally explain as two Orders, though not two Houses ; and we suggest that with regard to the popular Order, which will be the more numerous, the provisions of the Act may be altered at any period after the first Dissolution ; but with regard to the other and less numerous Order, the provisions of the Act can only be altered after the assent of the Crown to an Address from the Legislative Body for that purpose. We should provide generally—and on that I conceive there would be no difference of opinion—that this Body should be subject to all the Prerogatives of the Crown, but only should insert a particular provision to the effect that its maximum duration, without Dissolution, should not exceed five years.

I will now tell the House—and I would beg particular attention to this—what are the functions that we propose to withdraw from the cognizance of this Legislative Body. The three grand and principal functions are, first, everything that relates to the Crown—Succession, Prerogatives, and the mode of administering powers

during incapacity, Regency, and, in fact, all that belongs to the Crown. The next would be all that belongs to defence—the Army, the Navy, the entire organizations of armed force. I do not say the Police Force, which I will touch upon by-and-by, but everything belonging to defence. And the third would be the entire subject of Foreign and Colonial relations. Those are the subjects most properly Imperial, and I will say belonging, as a principle, to the Legislature established under the Act of Union and sitting at Westminster. There are some other subjects which I will briefly touch upon. In the first place, it would not be competent to the domestic Legislature in Ireland to alter the provisions of the Act which we are now about to pass, as I hope, and which I ask that we should pass with the consent of the three countries—it would not be competent to the Irish Legislative Body to alter those provisions, excepting in points where they are designedly left open as part of the original contract and settlement. We do not propose universal disability as to contracts ; but there are certain contracts made in Ireland under circumstances so peculiar that we think we ought to except them from the action of the Legislative Body. There are also some analogous provisions made in respect to Charters anterior to the Act which, in our opinion, ought only to be alterable after the assent of the Crown to an Address from the Legislative Body for that purpose. There is another disability that we propose to lay upon the Legislative Body ; and it is one of those with respect to which I am bound to say, in my belief, there is no real apprehension that the thing would be done ; but, at the same time, though there may not be a warranted apprehension, there are many honest apprehensions which it is our duty to consider as far as we can. We propose to provide that the Legislative Body should not be competent to pass a law for the establishment or the endowment of any particular religion. Those I may call exceptions of principle. Then there are exceptions of what I may call practical necessity for ordinary purposes. The first of those is the Law of Trade and Navigation. I assume that, as to Trade and Navigation at large, it would be a great calamity to Ireland to be separated from Great Britain. The question of taxation in relation to Trade and Navigation I have already mentioned. The same observation applies to the subject of Coinage and Legal Tender ; but we do not propose to use the term “ currency,” simply because there is an ambiguity about it. Ireland might think fit to pass a law providing for the extinction of private issues in Ireland, and that no bank-

notes should be issued in Ireland, except under the authority and for the advantage of the State. I own it is my opinion that Ireland would do an extremely sensible thing if she passed such a law. It is my most strong and decided opinion that we ought to have the same law ourselves ; but the block of Business has prevented that, and many other good things, towards the attainment of which I hope we are now going to open and clear the way. I only use that as an illustration to show that I should be very sorry if we were needlessly to limit the free action of the Irish Legislature upon Irish matters. There are other subjects on which I will not dwell. One of them is the subject of Weights and Measures ; another is the subject of Copyright. These are not matters for discussion at the present moment.

There is, however, one other important subject with regard to which we propose to leave it entirely open to the judgment of Ireland—that subject is the Post Office. Our opinion is that it would be for the convenience of both countries if the Post Office were to remain under the control of the Postmaster General ; but the Post Office requires an army of servants, and I think that Ireland might not wish to see all the regulations connected with that unarmed army left to an English authority. We have, therefore, placed the Post Office in the Bill under circumstances which would enable the Legislative Body in Ireland to claim for itself authority on this subject if it should see fit. There are some other matters, such as the Census, the Quarantine Laws, and one or two others which stand in the same category. Now, Sir, that I believe I may give as a sufficient description of the exceptions from the Legislative action of the proposed Irish Legislature, bearing in mind the proposition that everything which is not excepted is conferred. I have dealt with the powers of the Legislative Body.

I come next to the composition of the Legislative Body. We propose to provide for it as follows. I have referred to the protection of minorities. We might constitute a Legislative Body in Ireland by a very brief enactment if we were to say that the 103 Members now representing Ireland and 103 more Members, perhaps elected by the same constituencies, should constitute the one and only Legislative House in Ireland, without the introduction of what I may call the dual element. But, Sir, we are of opinion that if a proposition of that kind were made, in the first place it would be stated that it did not afford legitimate protection for minorities. And, in the second place, it

might be thought by many of those who would be less sensitive on the subject of minorities that some greater provision was required for stability and consistency, in the conduct of the complex work of legislation, than could possibly be supplied by a single set of men elected under an absolutely single influence. Upon that account, Sir, we propose to introduce into this Legislative Body what we have termed two Orders. These Orders would sit and deliberate together. There would be a power on the demand of either Order for separate voting. The effect of that separate voting would be that while the veto was in force, while it sufficed to bar the enactment of a Bill, there would be an absolute veto of one Order upon the other. Such veto, in our view, might be salutary and useful for the purpose of insuring deliberation and consistency with adequate consideration in the business of making laws. But it ought not to be perpetual. If it were perpetual, a block would arise, as it might arise conceivably, and as really, we may almost say, we have seen it arise in certain cases in the Colonies, particularly in one where there were two perfectly independent Orders. What we, therefore, propose is that this veto can only be operative for a limited time, say until a Dissolution, or for a period of three years, whichever might be the longer of the two.

So much, Sir, for the relation of these two Orders, the one to the other. I may observe that that distinction of Orders would be available, and is almost necessary, with a view to maintaining the only form of control over the Judicial Body known to us in this country—namely, the concurrence of two authorities chosen under somewhat different influences in one common conclusion with regard to the propriety of removing a Judge from his office.

Now, Sir, I will just describe very briefly the composition of these Orders. It may not have occurred to many gentlemen that if we succeed in the path we are now opening, with respect to the twenty-eight distinguished individuals who now occupy the place of Representative Peers of Ireland, it will not be possible, we think, for them to continue to hold their places in the House of Lords after the Irish Representatives have been removed from attending the House of Commons. I do not say that the precedent is an exact one; but the House may remember that, in the case of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, we did disable the Bishops who were entitled to sit for life from continuing—I mean disable them personally from continuing—to sit in the House of Lords after the Disestablishment of the

Irish Church. We do not wish, Sir, to entail this personal disability. We propose that these twenty-eight Peers shall have the option of sitting, if they think fit, as a portion of the first Order in the Irish Legislative Assembly. And that they shall have the power—that they shall personally have the power—of sitting there, as they sit in the House of Lords, for life. There may, Sir, be those who think this option will not be largely used. I am not one of that number. I believe that the Irish Peers have an Irish as well as an Imperial patriotism. In the eighteenth century Irish Peers were not ashamed of the part they played in the Irish Parliament. It was, I think, the Duke of Leinster who moved the Address in the Irish House of Peers, which he carried, expressing the confidence of that House in Lord Fitzwilliam. I may be too sanguine; but I say boldly that if this measure pass under happy circumstances, especially if it pass without political exasperation, one of its effects will be a great revival of the local, as well as a great confirmation and extension of Imperial patriotism. At any rate, it is our duty, I think, to provide that the Irish Peers, the twenty-eight Representative Irish Peers, may form part of the Irish Legislative Body. There will be no disability entailed upon any Irish Peer from being at once a Member of the Irish Legislative Body and likewise of the House of Lords. In the last century many distinguished men sat in both; and, in the circumstances, we certainly see no cause for putting an end to the double qualification which was thus enjoyed, and which, I think, worked beneficially. There is a difficulty, however, to which I will just advert for one moment in combining the connexion or place of these twenty-eight Peers who are to sit for life with the rest of the first Order of the Chamber. We propose, as to the remainder of the first Order, that it shall consist of seventy-five Members, to be elected by the Irish people under conditions which we propose to specify in the Schedule to the Act, not yet filled up as to its details. But I mention at once the two provisions which would apply to the election of seventy-five Members. First of all, the constituency would be a constituency composed of persons occupying to the value of £25 and upwards; and, secondly, they would be elected for a period, as a general rule, of ten years, with a little exception I need not now refer to. Thirdly, they will be elected subject to a property qualification of realty to the extent of £200 a year, or of personality to the extent of £200 a year, or a capital value of £4,000. The Peers would ultimately be replaced

by twenty-eight Members, elected under the above conditions. We cannot insure that all these twenty-eight Peers shall die at the same time. It would, consequently, be extremely difficult to devise an electoral machinery for the purpose of supplying their places by election. We therefore propose to grant to the Crown power, limited to a term which we think may fairly well exhaust the present generation, of filling their places, by nomination, not for life, but down to the date to be fixed by the Act. After the system had ceased to operate, and the Representative Peers had ceased to be in that first Order, the first Order of the Legislative Body would be elected entirely upon the basis I have described.

With regard to the second Order, its composition would be simple. Of course, it would be proposed to the 103 gentlemen who now represent Ireland in this House from county districts, from citizen towns, and from the University of Dublin, that they should take their places in the Irish Legislative Chamber in Dublin. We should likewise propose, as nearly as possible, to duplicate that Body. Another 101 Members, not 103, we propose should be elected by the county districts and the citizen towns in exactly the same manner as that in which the present 101 Members for counties and towns have been elected. We shall also propose that in the event of any refusal to sit, refusals to accept the option given, the place shall be filled up by election under the machinery now existing. I ought to say a word about Dublin University. We do not propose to interfere by any action of ours with the existing arrangements of Dublin University in one way or another. But certainly we could not ask the House to adopt a plan at our suggestion which would double the representation of Dublin University. We propose to leave it as it is, but, at the same time, to empower the Legislative Body, if it should think fit, to appoint a corresponding representation by two Members in favour of the Royal University of Ireland. There would be no compulsion to exercise that power; but it would be left to the discretion of the Legislative Body. The effect of that would be to give to the first Order of the proposed Legislative Chamber or Body a number making 103; to give to the second Order the number of 206 at the outside, or 204 if the power of the Royal University were not exercised, and to leave the relations of the two Orders upon the footing which I have described.

I must now say a few words upon the subject of the Executive ;

and what we think most requisite with regard to the Executive is that our Act should be as elastic as possible. It is quite evident that, though the legislative transition can be made, and ought to be made, *per saltum*, by a single stroke, the Executive transition must necessarily be gradual. We propose, therefore, Sir, to leave everything as it is until it is altered in the regular course; so that there shall be no breach of continuity in the Government of the country, but that by degrees, as may be arranged by persons whom we feel convinced will meet together in a spirit of co-operation, and will find no great, much less insurmountable, difficulty in their way, the old state of things shall be adjusted to the new. On the one hand, the Representatives of the old system will remain on the ground; on the other hand the principle of responsible Government is freely and fully conceded. That principle of responsible Government will work itself out in every necessary detail. It has often, Sir, been proposed to abolish the Viceroyalty, and some gentlemen have even been sanguine enough to believe that to abolish the Viceroyalty was to solve the whole Irish problem. I must say that I think that that involves a faculty of belief far beyond any power either of the understanding or imagination to which I have ever been able to aspire. We propose to leave the Viceroyalty without interference by the Act, except in the particulars which I am about to name. The Office of the Viceroyalty will only be altered by statute. He would not be the Representative of a Party. He would not quit Office with the outgoing Government. He would have round him, as he has now, in a certain form, a Privy Council, to aid and to advise him. Within that Privy Council the Executive Body would form itself under the action of the principal responsible Government, for the purpose of administering the various Offices of the State. The Queen would be empowered to delegate to him in case his Office should be permanently continued—which I am far from believing to be unlikely—any of the Prerogatives which she now enjoys, or which she would exercise under this Act; and, finally, we have not forgotten that his Office almost alone is still affected by one solitary outstanding religious disability—a kind of Lot's wife, when everything else has been destroyed—and that religious disability we propose by our Bill to remove.

The next point is with regard to the Judges of the Superior Courts, and here I draw a partial distinction between the present and the future Judges. As regards the Judges of the Superior

Courts now holding office, we desire to secure to them their position and their emoluments in the same absolute form as that in which they now exist. Although they would become chargeable upon the Consolidated Fund of Ireland, which we propose to constitute by the Act, still they would retain their lien—so to call it—on the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain. Under the peculiar circumstances of Ireland we cannot forget that some of these Judges, by no fault of their own, have been placed in relations more or less uneasy with popular influences, and with what, under the new Constitution, will in all probability be the dominating influence in that country. We cannot overlook the peculiarities of Irish history in framing the provisions of this Bill; and we therefore propose, both with regard to the Judges now holding office and with regard to other persons who, in what they deemed loyal service to the Empire, have been concerned in the administration and conduct of the Criminal Law in Ireland, that Her Majesty may, not lightly or wholesale, but if she should see cause on any particular occasion, by Order in Council antedate the pensions of these particular persons. With regard to the future Judges, we hold the matter to be more simple. We propose to provide that as they should hold office during good behaviour; that their salaries—these are the superior Judges alone—should be charged on the Irish Consolidated Fund; that they shall be removable only on a Joint Address from the two Orders of the Legislative Body; and that they should be appointed under the influence, as a general rule, of the responsible Irish Government. There is an exception which we propose to make in regard to the Court of Exchequer, which is a Court of Revenue Pleas. I will not enter into any details now, but the enormous financial relations which will subsist between Great Britain and Ireland, if our measure be carried, made us feel, for reasons which I shall, perhaps, on another occasion more fully explain, that it is necessary for us to keep a certain amount of hold on the Court of Exchequer, or, at least, on two of its Members; but the general rule of our measure will be that the action of the Judges will pass under the new Irish Executive, and will rest with them, just as it rested in former times with the old Irish Executive.

I must now say a few words on the important subject of the Irish Constabulary. The substance of those words really amounts to this—that I think there remains much for consideration in order to devise the details of a good and prudent system;

but we think it our first duty to give a distinct assurance to the present members of that distinguished and admirable force that their condition will not be put to prejudice by this Act, either in respect of their terms of office, their terms of service, or with regard to the authority under which they are employed. The case of the Dublin police is not quite the same ; but we propose the same conditions with regard to the Dublin police, as far, at least, as the terms of service are concerned. With regard to the local police I will say nothing, because I do not want at present to anticipate what may be matter hereafter for free consideration or discussion, or for the action of the Irish Legislative Body. There will be no breach of continuity in the administration with regard to the police. One thing I cannot omit to say. The Constabulary, as I have said, is an admirable force, and I do not intend to qualify in the smallest degree what I have already said ; but the Constabulary on its present footing exhibits one of the most remarkable instances of waste of treasure and of enormous expense, not with good results, but with unhappy results, with which, and under which, the civil government and the general government of Ireland have hitherto been carried on. The total charge of the Constabulary amounts to £1,500,000, including the Dublin police. Now, Ireland is a cheaper country than England, and if the service were founded on the same principle and organized in the same manner, it ought, per 1,000 of the population, to be cheaper in Ireland than in England, assuming Ireland to be in a normal condition ; and our object is to bring it into a normal condition.

Now, the House will, perhaps, be surprised when I tell them this—the present Constabulary of Ireland costs £1,500,000 a year, every penny of it now paid out of the British Exchequer. If the police of Ireland were organized upon the same principles and on the same terms as the police in England, instead of costing £1,500,000, it would cost £600,000 a year. That will convey to the House an idea, first, of the enormous charge at which we have been governing Ireland under our present system ; and, secondly, of the vast field for judicious reductions which the system I am now proposing ought to offer to the Irish people. I anticipate a vast reduction, both in the force and in the expenditure. The charge is now £1,500,000. We propose that the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain—this subject I shall revert to in the financial statement which I shall have to put before the House—shall for a time relieve the Irish Legislative

Body of all expenditure in excess of £1,000,000. I am bound to say that I do not look upon £1,000,000 as the proper charge to be imposed on Ireland. I am perfectly convinced, however, that the charge will be reduced to a much smaller sum, of which Ireland, of course, will reap the benefit. After two years the Legislative Body may fix the charge for the whole police and for the Constabulary of Ireland, with a saving of existing rights. One thing I must say. We have no desire to exempt the police of Ireland in its final form from the ultimate control of the Legislative Body. We have no jealousies on the subject ; and I own I have a strong personal opinion that, when once the recollection of the old antipathies has been effectually abated, the care of providing for the ordinary security of life and property of the citizens will be regarded as the very first duty of any good local Government in Ireland. I think it will be understood from what I have said that the Constabulary would remain under the present terms of service and under the present authority, although I do not say that this is to be so for ever. Assuming control over the Constabulary, that control will be prospective, and will not import any injury to existing rights.

With respect to the Civil Service, of course the future Civil Service of the country generally will be absolutely under the Legislative Body. With respect to the present Civil Service, we have not thought that their case was exactly analogous either to the Constabulary or the Judicial Offices, and yet it is a great transition, and moreover it will, without doubt, be the desire of the Legislative Body of Ireland forthwith, or very early, to effect a great economy in its establishment. We have, therefore, considered to some extent in what way we can at once provide what is just for the Civil Servants of Ireland, and, at the same time, set free the hands of the Legislative Body to proceed with this salutary work of economy and retrenchment. Our opinion is that, upon the whole, it will be wise in the joint interests of both to authorize the Civil Servants now serving to claim the gratuity or pension which would be due to them upon the abolition of their offices, provided they shall serve not less than two years, to prevent an inconvenient lapse in the practical business of the country, and at the close of those two years both parties would be free to negotiate afresh, the Civil Servants not being bound to remain, and the Legislative Body not being in any way bound to continue to employ them. That is all I have to say upon the subject of the new Irish Constitution.

I am afraid I have still many subjects on which I have some details to show, and I fear I have already detained the House too long. I have now, Sir, to give a practical exposition of the phrase which I have used, that we looked upon it as an essential condition of our plan that there should be an equitable distribution of Imperial charges. The meaning of that is, what proportion shall Ireland pay? I must remind gentlemen, before I enter upon the next explanation, that the proportion to be paid is not the only thing to be considered; you have to consider the basis upon which that proportionate payment is to be applied. Looking upon the proportionate payment, we now stand thus. At the time of the Union it was intended that Ireland should pay 2-17ths, or in the relation of 1 to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  out of the total charge of the United Kingdom. The actual true payment now made by the Irish taxpayer is not 1 to  $7\frac{1}{2}$ , but something under 1 to 12, or about 1 to  $11\frac{1}{2}$ —that is the total expenditure. The proposal I make is that the proportion chargeable to Ireland shall be 1 to 14, or 1-15th; but that will not be understood until I come to join it with other particulars. I will look, however, Sir, a little to the question what are the best tests of capacity to pay. Many of these tests have been suggested—one of them is the Income Tax, which I conceive to be a very important indication. The Income Tax, I believe, would give a proportion, not of 1 to 14, but of 1 to 19. This is to be borne in mind, if you have regard to the Income Tax—that while, on the one hand, it is paid in Ireland upon a lower valuation than in England or in Scotland—because, as we all know, in England Schedule A is levied on the full rent—it is also unquestionable that many Irishmen also hold securities upon which dividends are received in London and pay Income Tax, I hope, before the dividends come into the hands of the persons entitled to them. Therefore, it is almost a certainty that a considerable sum ought to be added to the Irish Income Tax, which would raise it from the proportion of 1 to 19 to, perhaps, 1 to 17. But there are two other tests which I consider far superior to the Income Tax. One is the test afforded us by the Death Duties, not by the amount levied, because the amounts levied vary capriciously according to the consanguinity scale, but by the property passing under the Death Duties. The amount of property on which, on an average of three years, the Death Duties fell was for Great Britain £170,000,000, and for Ireland £12,908,000, or 1 to 13. I have taken three years, because they represent the period since we

entered upon a somewhat new administration of the Death Duties, and that is by far the best basis of comparison. When we come to the valuation, inasmuch as Ireland is valued much lower in proportion to the real value than England and Scotland, the valuation in the latest year for which we have Returns is in Great Britain £166,000,000, and for Ireland £13,833,000, giving a proportion of 1 to 12, or 1-13th.

Under these circumstances what ought we to do? In my opinion, we ought to make for Ireland an equitable arrangement, and I think that when I propose to assume the proportion of 1-15th, it will be seen that that is an equitable or even generous arrangement, after I have mentioned three considerations. The first of these considerations is that if we start an Irish Legislative Body, we must start it with some balance to its credit. But if we are to start it with a balance to its credit, I know of no way except the solitary £20,000 a year which still remains to be worked out of the Church surplus after all the demands made upon it. I know of no way of honestly manufacturing that balance except by carving it out of the Budget for the coming year, and providing for the sum at the expense, as it will then be, not of the Irish Exchequer exclusively, but at the expense of the English and Scotch taxpayers. That is one consideration; the second consideration is this—I take this 1 to 14 or 1-15th for the purpose of ascertaining what share Ireland is to pay to the Imperial expenditure. But when I said that Ireland now pays 1 to 11½ or 1 to 12½ of the Imperial expenditure, I meant the amount of the whole gross Imperial expenditure; and when I say that we shall ask her to pay 1-15th of the Imperial expenditure in the future, that is an Imperial expenditure very materially cut down. For, upon consideration, it has been thought right, in computing the military expenditure, to exclude from it altogether what ought strictly to be called War Charges. We do not propose to assume, in fixing the future Imperial contribution of Ireland, to base that calculation on the supposition of her sharing in charges analogous, for example, to the Vote of Credit for £11,000,000 last year. Therefore, this proportion of 1-15th is to be applied to a scale of Imperial expenditure materially reduced.

But, Sir, there is another consideration which I think it right to mention. It is this—that this Imperial contribution would be paid by Ireland out of a fund composed, in the first instance, of the entire receipts paid into the Irish Exchequer;

but that, Sir, is not a true test of the amount of taxation paid by Ireland. There are goods which pay duty in England, and which are exported, duty paid, to Ireland, which are consumed in Ireland, and upon which, therefore, the duty is really paid by Irishmen, while the receipts go into the Imperial Exchequer. But there is not only a corresponding movement the other way, but there is a movement very much larger and more important. More than £1,000,000 of duty—I think £1,030,000—is paid upon spirits in Ireland that are exported to Great Britain. Every shilling of that duty is really paid by the Englishman and the Scotchman; but, at the same time, the whole receipts go into the Irish Exchequer. The same thing holds with respect to the porter brewed in Ireland. The same thing holds with regard to the very considerable manufacture of tobacco carried on in Ireland. We have made it the object of our best efforts to ascertain how much money Ireland loses to England by the process which I have described—and which I have no doubt is accurately understood by all Members of the House—how much money Ireland loses to Great Britain by the flow of duty-paid commodities from Great Britain to Ireland; and how much Great Britain loses to Ireland from the flow of such commodities from Ireland to Great Britain. The result of this investigation is—I state it with confidence, not actually as if it were to be demonstrated in every point by Parliamentary Returns, but I state it as a matter of certainty with regard to a far greater portion of the sum, and as a matter certainly subject to very little doubt—that the Irish receipt gains from Great Britain by the process I have described more than Great Britain gains from Ireland, and more, to no less an amount than £1,400,000, paid by the British taxpayer, and forming part of the Irish receipt. If you maintain the fiscal unity of the Empire, if you do not erect—which I trust you will not erect—Custom Houses between Great Britain and Ireland, if you let things take their natural course, according to the ordinary and natural movement of trade, £1,400,000 will be paid to the benefit of Ireland as a charge upon the English and Scotch taxpayer, and will form a portion of the fund out of which Ireland will defray the Imperial contribution which we propose to levy upon her

If this amount of Imperial contribution to be paid by Ireland, which I have described as 1-14th, comes to be reduced by subtracting this sum of £1,400,000, the portion which Ireland will have to pay will be, not 1-14th, but a fraction under 1-26th.

That is a very great change. It is a benefit she gets, not only in the state of the law, but owing to the course of trade. We cannot take it away without breaking up the present absolute freedom between the two countries. I hope this will be borne in mind by those who think this charge of 1-15th is a heavy charge to be thrown upon Ireland; and by those who think, as I certainly do, that in a case of this kind, after all that has occurred, when two countries are very strong and very rich compared with a third of far more restricted means, the pecuniary arrangement ought to be equitable and even bountiful in some moderate degree. It will be interesting to the House to know what payment *per capita* the plan I have described will allot to the Irishman and to the Briton respectively. I use the word "Briton" because I know that it will gratify my friends from Scotland. The incidence of this plan *per capita* I will state as follows:—In the first place, if I were to take the present contribution of Ireland to the entire expenditure of the country according to the receipt into the two Exchequers, the inhabitant in Great Britain pays £2 10s. *per capita*, and the inhabitant in Ireland £1 13s. 7d. That is obviously and inequitably high for Ireland. But if I take the real payment of the Irish taxpayer and compare that with the real payment of the English taxpayer, it will follow that the English payment is £2 10s. 11d. as against £1 7s. 10d. of Ireland, which is certainly a more equitable proportion.

Now I pass to the basis of 1-14th or 1-15th. This is not founded upon the total expenditure of the country; but upon what we are about to reckon as Imperial expenditure, and the respective contribution to the Imperial Exchequer. The respective contribution *per capita* will be for Great Britain £1 10s. 11d., and for Ireland 13s. 5d., and I do not think that that is an inequitable arrangement. I wish to exhibit exactly what alterations we propose to make. Under the proportion now proposed Ireland will pay 13s. 5d.; while, if the present proportion were maintained, she would pay 16s. 10d., which will be a very considerable diminution in the amount of her contribution *per capita*.

I will state only one other striking fact with regard to the Irish expenditure. The House would like to know what an amount has been going on—and which at this moment is going on—of what I must call not only a waste of public money, but a demoralizing waste of public money, demoralizing in its in-

fluence upon both countries. The civil charges *per capita* at this moment are in Great Britain 8s. 2d. and in Ireland 16s. They have increased in Ireland in the last fifteen years by 63 per cent., and my belief is that if the present legislative and administrative systems be maintained, you must make up your minds to a continued, never-ending, and never-to-be-limited, augmentation. The amount of the Irish contribution upon the basis I have described would be as follows:—1-15th of the annual Debt charge of £22,000,000 would be £1,466,000; 1-15th of the Army and Navy charge, after excluding what we call War Votes, and also excluding the charges for Volunteer and Yeomanry, would be £1,666,000; and the amount of the Civil charges, which are properly considered Imperial, would entail upon Ireland £110,000, or a total charge properly Imperial of £3,242,000. I am now ready to present what I may call an Irish Budget—a debtor and creditor account for the Irish Exchequer. The Customs produce in Ireland a gross sum of £1,880,000, the Excise £4,300,000, the Stamps £600,000, the Income Tax £550,000, and Non-Tax Revenue, including the Post Office, £1,020,000. And perhaps here, again, I ought to mention, as an instance of the demoralizing waste which now attends Irish administration, that which will, perhaps, surprise the House to know—namely, that while in England and Scotland we levy from the Post Office and Telegraph system a large surplus income, in Ireland the Post Office and the Telegraphs just pay their expenses, or leave a surplus so small as not to be worth mentioning. I call that a very demoralizing way of spending money. Although I believe that there is no purer Department in the country than the Post Office, yet the practical effect of our method of administering Ireland by influences known to be English, and not Irish, leads to a vast amount of unnecessary expenditure.

The total receipts of the Irish Exchequer are thus shown to amount to £8,350,000; and against that I have to place an Imperial contribution, which I may call permanent, because it will last for a great number of years, of £3,242,000. I put down £1,000,000 for the Constabulary, because that would be a first charge, although I hope that it will soon come under very effective reduction. I put down £2,510,000 for the other Civil charges in Ireland, and there, again, I have not the slightest doubt that that charge will likewise be very effectually reduced by an Irish Government. Finally, the collection of Revenue is £834,000, making a total charge thus far of £7,586,000. Then we have

thought it essential to include in this arrangement, not only for our own sakes, but for the sake of Ireland also, a payment on account of the Sinking Fund against the Irish portion of the National Debt. The Sinking Fund is now paid for the whole National Debt. We have now got to allot a certain portion of that debt to Ireland. We think it necessary to maintain that Sinking Fund, and especially for the interest of Ireland. When Ireland gets the management of her own affairs, I venture to prophesy that she will want, for useful purposes, to borrow money. But the difficulty of that operation will be enormously higher or lower, according to the condition of her public credit. Her public credit is not yet born. It has yet to lie, like an infant, in the cradle, and it may require a good deal of nursing; but no nursing would be effectual, unless it were plain and palpable to the eye of the whole world that Ireland had provision in actual working order for discharging her old obligations, so as to make it safe for her to contract new obligations more nearly allied to her own immediate wants. I, therefore, put down £750,000 for Sinking Fund. That makes the total charge £7,946,000, against a total income of £8,350,000, or a surplus of £404,000. But I can state to the House that that £404,000 is a part only of the Fund which, under the present state of things, it would be the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the three countries to present to you for the discharge of our collective expenditure.

Sir, the House has heard me with astonishing patience while I have endeavoured to perform what I knew must prove an almost interminable task. There is only one subject more on which I feel it still necessary to detain the House. It is commonly said in England and Scotland—and in the main it is, I think, truly said—that we have for a great number of years been struggling to pass good laws for Ireland. We have sacrificed our time; we have neglected our own business; we have advanced our money—which I do not think at all a great favour conferred on her—and all this in the endeavour to give Ireland good laws. That is quite true in regard to the general course of legislation since 1829. But many of those laws have been passed under influences which can hardly be described otherwise than as influences of fear. Some of our laws have been passed in a spirit of grudging and of jealousy. It is most painful for me to consider that, after four or five years of Parliamentary battle, when a Municipal Corporation Act was passed for Ireland, it was a very

different measure to that which, in England and Scotland, created complete and absolute municipal life. Were I to come to the history of the Land Question I could tell a still sadder tale. Let no man assume that he fully knows that history until he has followed it from year to year, beginning with the Devon Commission, or with the efforts of Mr. Sharman Crawford. The appointment of the Devon Commission does, in my opinion, the highest honour to the memory of Sir Robert Peel. Then, notice the mode in which the whole labours of that Commission were frustrated by the domination of selfish interests in the British Parliament. Our first effort at land legislation was delayed until so late a period as the year 1870. I take this opportunity of remarking that sound views on the Land Question were not always confined to Irish Members, nor to the Liberal side of this House. The late Mr. Napier, who became Lord Chancellor of Ireland, when he sat in this House for the academical constituency of Dublin, developed, with great earnestness, truly liberal views on the subject of Irish land, and made generous efforts in that direction—efforts which were, however, intercepted.

But, Sir, I do not deny the general good intentions of Parliament on a variety of great and conspicuous occasions, and its desire to pass good laws for Ireland. But let me say that, in order to work out the purposes of Government, there is something more in this world occasionally required than even the passing of good laws. It is sometimes requisite not only that good laws should be passed, but also that they should be passed by the proper persons. The passing of many good laws is not enough in cases where the strong permanent instincts of the people, their distinctive marks of character, the situation and history of the country require not only that these laws should be good, but that they should proceed from a congenial and native source, and besides being good laws should be their own laws. In former times it might have been doubted—I have myself doubted—whether this instinct had been thus developed in Ireland. If such doubts could be entertained before the last General Election they can be entertained no longer.

The principle that I am laying down I am not laying down exceptionally for Ireland. It is the very principle upon which, within my recollection, to the immense advantage of the country, we have not only altered, but revolutionized our method of governing the Colonies. I had the honour to hold Office in the Colonial Department—perhaps I ought to be ashamed to confess it—

fifty-one years ago. At that time the Colonies were governed from Downing Street. It is true that some of them had Legislative Assemblies; but with these we were always in conflict. We were always fed with information by what was termed the British Party in those Colonies. A clique of gentlemen constituted themselves the British Party; and the non-British Party, which was sometimes called the "Disloyal Party," was composed of the enormous majority of the population. We had continual shocks, continual debates, and continual conflicts. All that has changed. England tried to pass good laws for the Colonies at that period; but the Colonies said—"We do not want your good laws; we want our own." We admitted the reasonableness of that principle, and it is now coming home to us from across the seas. We have to consider whether it is applicable to the case of Ireland. Do not let us disguise this from ourselves. We stand face to face with what is termed Irish nationality. Irish nationality vents itself in the demand for local autonomy, or separate and complete self-government in Irish, not in Imperial, affairs. Is this an evil in itself? Is it a thing that we should view with horror or apprehension? Is it a thing which we ought to reject or accept only with a wry face, or ought we to wait until some painful and sad necessity is incumbent upon the country, like the necessity of 1780 or the necessity of 1793? Sir, I hold that it is not. There is a saying of Mr. Grattan—who was, indeed, a fiery and a fervid orator; but he was more than that; he was a statesman; his aphorisms are, in my opinion, weighty, and even profound, and I commend them to the careful reflection and examination of the country—when he was deprecating the surrender of the Irish Parliament, and pointing out that its existence did not prevent the perfect union of the two countries, he remarked—"The Channel forbids union; the ocean forbids separation." Is that Channel nothing? Do what you will with your steamers and your telegraphs, can you make that Channel cease to exist, or to be as if it were not? These sixty miles may appear a little thing; but I ask you what are the twenty miles between England and France? These few miles of water have exercised a vital influence upon the whole history, the whole development, and the whole national character of our people.

These, Sir, are great facts. I hold that there is such a thing as local patriotism, which, in itself, is not bad, but good. The Welshman is full of local patriotism—the Scotchman is full

of local patriotism ; the Scotch nationality is as strong as it ever was, and should the occasion arise—which I believe it never can—it will be as ready to assert itself as in the days of Bannockburn. I do not believe that that local patriotism is an evil. I believe it is stronger in Ireland even than in Scotland. Englishmen are eminently English, Scotchmen are profoundly Scotch ; and, if I read Irish history aright, misfortune and calamity have wedded her sons to her soil. The Irishman is more profoundly Irish ; but it does not follow that, because his local patriotism is keen, he is incapable of Imperial patriotism. There are two modes of presenting the subject. The one is to present what we now recommend as good, and the other to recommend it as a choice of evils. Well, Sir, I have argued the matter as if it were a choice of evils ; I have recognized, as facts entitled to attention, the jealousies which I do not share or feel ; and I have argued it on that ground as the only ground on which it can be argued, not only in a mixed auditory, but in the public mind and to the country, which cannot give a minute investigation to the operations of that complicated question. But, in my own heart, I cherish the hope that this is not merely the choice of the lesser evil, but may prove to be rather a good in itself. What is the answer to this ? It is only to be found in the view which rests upon the basis of despair and of absolute condemnation of Ireland and Irishmen as exceptions to the beneficent provisions which enable men in general, and Europeans in particular, and Americans to be capable of performing civil duties, and which considers an Irishman either as a *lusus naturæ* or one for whom justice, common sense, moderation, and national prosperity have no meaning ; and who can only understand and appreciate perpetual strife and dissension. Well, Sir, I am not going to argue that view, which, to my mind, is founded on a monstrous misconception. I say that the Irishman is as capable of loyalty as another man—I say that if his loyalty has been checked in its development, why is it ? Because the laws by which he is governed do not present themselves to him, as they do to us in England and Scotland, with a native and congenial aspect ; and I think I can refer to two illustrations which go strongly to support the doctrine I have advanced. Take the case of the Irish soldier and of the Irish Constabulary. Have you a braver or a more loyal man in your Army than the Irishman, who has shared every danger with his Scotch and English com-

rades, and who has never been behind them, when confronted by peril for the sake of the honour and safety of his Empire? Compare this case with that of an ordinary Irishman in Ireland. The Irish soldier has voluntarily placed himself under military law, which is to him a self-chosen law, and he is exempted from that difficulty which works upon the population in Ireland—namely, that they are governed by a law which they do not feel has sprung from the soil. Consider how common it is to hear the observation, in discussing the circumstances of Ireland, that while the Constabulary are largely taken from the Roman Catholic population and from the very class most open to disaffection, where disaffection exists, they form a splendid model of obedience, discipline, and devotion such as the world can hardly match. How is this? It is because they have undertaken a voluntary service which takes them completely out of the category of the ordinary Irishman. They are placed under an authority which is to them congenial because freely accepted. Their loyalty is not checked by the causes that operate on the agricultural population of Ireland. It has grown as freely in the Constabulary and in the Army as if every man in the Constabulary and every Irish soldier had been an Englishman or a Scotchman.

However this may be, we are sensible that we have taken an important decision—our choice has been made. It has not been made without thought; it has been made in the full knowledge that trial and difficulty may confront us on our path. We have no right to say that Ireland, through her constitutionally-chosen Representatives, will accept the plan I offer. Whether it will be so I do not know—I have no title to assume it; but if Ireland does not cheerfully accept it, it is impossible for us to attempt to force upon her what is intended to be a boon; nor can we possibly press England and Scotland to accord to Ireland what she does not heartily welcome and embrace. There are difficulties; but I rely upon the patriotism and sagacity of this House; I rely on the effects of free and full discussion; and I rely more than all upon the just and generous sentiments of the two British nations. Looking forward, I ask the House to assist us in the work which we have undertaken, and to believe that no trivial motive can have driven us to it—to assist us in this work which, we believe, will restore Parliament to its dignity and legislation to its free and unimpeded course. I ask you to stay that waste of public treasure which is involved in the

present system of government and legislation in Ireland, and which is not a waste only, but which demoralizes while it exhausts. I ask you to show to Europe and to America that we, too, can face political problems which America twenty years ago faced, and which many countries in Europe have been called upon to face, and have not feared to deal with. I ask that in our case we should practise, with firm and fearless hand—what we have so often preached—the doctrine which we have so often inculcated upon others—namely, that the concession of local self-government is not the way to sap or impair, but the way to strengthen and consolidate unity. I ask that we should learn to rely less upon merely written stipulations, and more upon those better stipulations which are written on the heart and mind of man. I ask that we should apply to Ireland that happy experience which we have gained in England and in Scotland, where the course of generations has now taught us, not as a dream or a theory, but as practice and as life, that the best and surest foundation we can find to build upon is the foundation afforded by the affections, the convictions, and the will of the nation ; and it is thus, by the decree of the Almighty, that we may be enabled to secure at once the social peace, the fame, the power, and the permanence of the Empire.

## INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

- Aberdeen, Speeches delivered at, 48-73  
 Aberfeldy, Speech delivered at, 60  
 "Abolition of the Negro Apprenticeship," Speech, 91  
 Abolition of Tests (Oxford), 29, 32, 36  
 Abyssinia, Expedition to, 37, 39 ; War Prize, 47  
 Academical Institutions (Ireland), 11  
 Address, The Debates on, 11, 15, 18, 20, 24, 29, 32, 35, 37, 40, 42, 45, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 61, 63, 66, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 87  
 "Address and Speeches delivered in Manchester," 94  
 "Address to the Electors of Midlothian, etc.," 101  
 Adjournment, Motions for, 75, 76, 86  
 Administration of Law (Ireland), 85  
 Administrative Reform, 19  
 Admiralty, The, *see* Navy  
 Advertisement Duty, 15, 16  
 "Affairs of Greece, and the Foreign Policy of the Administration," Speech, 92  
 Afghanistan, 75 ; Afghan War, 58, 59, 63, 64 ; Afghan Boundary Dispute, 75  
 Africa, Oxford and Cambridge Mission in, 24  
 "Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East," 98, 100  
 Agriculture, 28, 66, 71 ; Agricultural Distress, 13 ; Agricultural Holdings (England) Bill, 54 ; Agricultural Interest, 19 ; Agricultural Labourers, 82, 83, 87 ; Agricultural Statistics, 10, 11 ; Agriculture and Commerce, Minister of, 64  
*Alabama* Award, 50, 51  
 Albany, Duke of, 66, 72  
 Alcester, Lord (Annuity Bill), 70  
 Alexander II, Assassination of, 63  
 Alexandria, Bombardment of, 68  
 Alfred, Prince, *see* Edinburgh, Duke of  
 America, United States of, 19, 20, 28, 42, 50, 51 ; Indirect Claims, 48, 49 ; Fenianism in, 32 ; McKinley Tariff, 84 ; Recognition of the Southern Confederacy, 29 ; Treaty of Arbitration on, 88 ; Treaty of Washington, 47, 48, 49, 51  
 American Civil War, 27, 28  
 American Thanksgiving Dinner, 50  
 "Ancient Beliefs in a Future State, On the," 104  
 Ancient Monuments, 63  
 Andrassy Note, 54  
 Anglo-German Agreement Bill, 84  
 Anglo-Turkish Convention, 58, 61, 64  
 Annuities Bill, 29, 30  
 Annuities Bill, Terminable, 33  
 Annuities, Consolidated (Ireland), 15  
 Appellate Jurisdiction Bill, 20  
 Appellate, Jurisdiction of House of Lords, 52  
 Appointments : Civil and Diplomatic, 41 ; Civil Service, 41  
 "Approaching General Election, The," 99  
 Appropriation Act, 27, 28, 31, 32, 52, 65, 68, 71, 73, 79  
 Arbitration, 50  
 "Archaic Greece and the East," 104  
 Armaments, On Reduction of, 62  
 Armenia, 62, 70, 90  
 Arms Bill, 76  
 Army : Auxiliary Forces, 76 ; Condition of, 18 ; Discipline Bill, 59, 63 ; Estimates, 35, 46 ;

# 646 INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

- Indian Army, 22; Purchase System, 47; Recruiting, 20; Regulation Bill, Army, 46, 47, 48; Reserves, 57; Supplementary Estimates, 72; Vote of Thanks (Abyssinian Expedition), 39
- Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Bill, 67, 68
- Arthur, Prince, *see* Connaught, Duke of
- Art Collections, Science and, 31
- Art Labour, 58
- Arts, Fine, 54
- Ashantee War, 53
- Asia, Central, 42, 51, 74
- Asia Minor, 62
- Assessed Rates Bill, 42
- Assyrian Mythology, 83
- Attorneys and Solicitors Certificate Duty, 15, 31
- Audit of Public Accounts, 42
- Australian Colonies Government Bill, 13
- Austro-Prussian Question, 34
- "Autobiography, A Chapter of," 95
- Bakers, Masters and Journeymen, 12
- Balerno, Speech delivered at, 61
- Balfour, Mr., 81, 87
- Balkan Principalities, 21, 60
- Ballot Bill, 45, 48, 49
- Bank Act, 21, 51
- Bank Acts (Scotland), 29
- Bank Issues Indemnity Bill, 21
- Bank Notes, £1, 67
- Bank Notes Issue Bill, 31
- Bank Notes (Ireland) Bill, 33
- Bank Notes (Scotland) Bill, 30
- Bank of England Committee, 25
- Bank of Ireland Bill, 31
- Banks of Issue Bill, 31
- Banking, Currency and, 34
- Bankers' Act Amendment Bill, 53
- Bankruptcy Bill, 42, 69, 71
- Barry, Mr., 44
- Basutos, The, 61
- Bath, Speech delivered at, 55
- Beaconsfield, Lord, 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 23, 30, 32, 36, 38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 48, 52, 64
- Beatrice, Princess, Dowry for, 75
- Beauty, Appreciation of, 84
- Bechuanaland, Boer Invasion of, 69
- Beer Duties, 75
- Belgium, Neutrality of, 45
- Benefices in Plurality Bill, 13
- Bengal Tenancy Bill, 74
- Bentinck, Lord G., 12
- Berlin, Congress and Treaty of, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62
- "Berlin Treaty and the Anglo-Turkish Convention, The," Speech, 99
- Bermondsey, Speech delivered at, 58
- Berryer, Banquet to M., 31
- Berwick, Speech delivered at, 55
- Bible (Authorized Version), 44
- Biggar, Mr., 65
- "Bill for the better Government of Ireland," Speech, 101
- "Bill for Divorce, The," 93
- "Bill for the Extension of the Suffrage in Towns," Speech, 94
- Bimetallism, 82
- Birmingham, Speeches delivered at, 56, 81
- "Bishop Butler and his Censors," 104
- Bishopric of Bristol Bill, 73
- Bishops (Scotland), 20
- Bishops in House of Lords, 44
- Bishops' Resignation Bill, 42
- Blackheath, Speeches delivered at, 48, 52, 55, 401-425
- "Blackheath, A Speech delivered at, . . . together with letters, on the Question of the East," 97
- Black Sea Conference, 45
- Bode, Baron de, Case of, 17
- Bodmin—Election Compromises, 23
- Bodmin, Speech delivered at, 82
- Boer Invasion of Bechuanaland, 69
- Bolton, Speech delivered at, 31
- Bombay* and *Oneida* (Ships), 45
- Bonaparte, Prince Lucien, Pension to, 71
- Bonded Corn Bill, 9
- Bonnyrigg, Speech delivered at, 61
- Books, 58, 80
- "Books and the Housing of them," 103-105
- Bootle, Speech delivered at, 40
- Borneo, 14
- Borough Franchise Bill, 30
- Bosnia, 55, 56
- Boundary Bill, 38
- Bouverie, Bartholomew (Pseudonym of W. E. Gladstone), 91
- Bradlaugh, Mr., 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70, 71, 75, 85

# INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS 647

- Brand, Speaker (Lord Hampden), 72  
 "Braybrooke, Notice of the late Lord," 94  
 Brazil, 10  
 Brechin, Speech delivered at, 73  
 Brewers' Licences, 27, 53  
 Bribery, 6  
 Bribery Prevention Bills, 17  
 Bright, Mr. Jacob, 47  
 Bright, Mr. John, 68, 70, 81  
 British Columbia, 42  
 British North Borneo Company, 66  
 "British Poetry of the Nineteenth Century," 103  
 British Trade, 67  
 Brooke, Sir James (Rajah), 14  
 Brougham, Lord, 39  
 Buckley, Speeches delivered at, 29, 58  
 Budget Speeches : first Budget, 15, 182-252 ; 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 53, 60, 62, 63, 67, 78, 79, 253-311  
 Buildings, Public Lands and, 30  
 Bulgaria, 57  
 Bulgarian Atrocities, 55  
     *See* Eastern Question  
     "... Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East," 97 ; Dutch Translation, 98 ; Russian Translation, 98.  
 Burial Acts Amendment Bill, 21  
 Burials Bill, 28, 53  
 Burmah, 76  
 Burslem, Speech delivered at, 29  
 Business of the House, 48, 60, 63, 67, 75, 78, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 87  
 Butt, Mr., 53  
 Bye-Elections, Lessons of the (1889), 82  
 Cabinet, Personal Explanation of Retirement from, 11 ; Withdrawal from, 18  
*Cagliari*, Capture of the, 21  
 Calumnies, Replies to Personal, 40  
 Cambridge Education Bill, Oxford and, 36  
 Cambridge, Princess Mary of, 34  
 Cambridge, Oxford and, in Central Africa, 24  
 Cambridge, Professors of Oxford and, 13  
 Cambridge, Speech delivered at, 24  
 Cambridge University Bill, 19  
 Cambridge, Universities of Oxford and, Bill, 65  
 Canada, 7 ; American Boundary, 51 ; Clergy Reserves Bill, 8, 15 ; Corn Law, 9 ; Disturbances in, 12 ; Loan Bill, 42, 51 ; Railway Loan, 35, 42  
 "Canada Union Bill," Speech, 91  
 Canning, Lord, 22, 57  
 Canons, Deans and, Resignation Bill, 48  
 Canterbury Cathedral, 52  
 Cape of Good Hope, 7  
 Capital and Labour, 39  
 Cardiff, Speeches delivered at, 78, 82  
 Cardwell, Lord, 46  
 Carlisle, Speech delivered at, 84, 86  
 Carnarvon, Speech delivered at, 87  
 Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, 12  
 Cattle Diseases Bill, 32  
 Cattle, Importation of Live, 8  
 Cattle : Malt for Cattle Bill, 29  
 Cattle Market Bill, Metropolitan Foreign, 39  
 Cattle Trade, Foreign, 39  
 Caxton, 56  
 Censure, Votes of, 53, 65, 71, 72, 74, 87  
 Ceramic Art, 56  
 Certificate Duty, Attorneys', etc., 31  
 Cetewayo, 67  
 Ceylon, 14  
 Chamberlain, Mr. J., 88  
 Chambers of Agriculture, Deputation from, 66  
 Chancellors, Judges and, 19  
 Channel Tunnel, 69, 79, 80, 84  
 "Channel Tunnel," Speech, 102  
 Chaplains, Speech against Appointment of Dissenting, to Prisons, 7  
 Charity, Administration of, 58  
 Charity Commission, 59  
 Charity Trust Funds, Income Tax on, 28, 312, 341  
 "Charity Voting Reform," Speech, 99  
 Chester, Speeches delivered at, 19, 21, 25, 28, 31, 49, 54, 60, 83, 84, 88, 90  
 Chiltern Hundreds, 23  
 China, War in, 8, 20, 21, 25, 26  
 Christian and Classical Education, 21

# 648, INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

- Christian Civilization, 31  
 "Church of England and Ritualism, The," 97  
 Church—Patronage of Benefices, 63  
 "Church Principles considered in their Results," 91  
 Church Rates, 7, 12  
 Church Rates Abolition Bill, 18, 22, 25, 33, 35  
 Church Revenue, 50  
 Church (Irish) Bill—Lords Amendments, 42  
 Church Establishment (Ireland), 31  
 Church Reform (Ireland) Bill, 6  
 Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill, 53  
 Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill, Speech . . . on," 96  
 "Church in Wales, The," Speech, 95  
 Churchill, Lord Randolph, 77  
 Churchward, Mr., 35  
 City Companies, 54  
 Civic Institutions, 50  
 Civil and Diplomatic Appointments, 41  
 Civil List, 47, 49  
 Civil Officers, Pensions for, 40, 41, 42  
 Civil Service, 19, 24, 45, 72, 75, 76, 81; Appointments, 41; Competitions, 29; Estimates, 26, 27, 29, 32, 37, 49, 50, 58, 61, 68, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, 84, 86; Examinations, 25, 26; Ireland, 52; Reform of, 19  
 Clapham Common, Speech delivered at, 86  
 Claridge, Sir J. T., 12  
 Clark, Sir Andrew, 90  
 Class Interests, Government and, 61  
 Classical Education, 21  
 Clergy, Condition of the, 90; Discipline (Immorality) Bill, 86; Irish, Future Status of, 41; Relief Bill, 12  
 "Clergy Relief Bill," 92  
 Clergy Reserves (Canada) Bill, 8  
 Clerical Profession, The, 85  
 Closure Resolution, 63, 67  
 Coal: Commission on, 34; Export Duties, 9; Resources of the Country, 31  
 Coal Whippers Bill, 9, 19  
 Cobden Club, 34  
 Cobden, Richard, 10, 20, 34  
 "Coercion in Ireland," Speech, 102  
 Collection of Taxes Bill, 29, 30  
 Collegiate Churches, 12  
 Collier, Sir Robert, 48  
 Colonies: Administration—Canada, 7. Afghan War, 58, 59, 63, 64. Australian Colonies Government Bill, 13. Bengal Tenancy Bill, 74. British Columbia, 41. Burmah, 76. Canada, 7, 13; American Boundary, 51; Bill, 15; Disturbances in, 12; Loan Bill, 42, 51; Railway Loan, 35, 42. Ceylon, 14. Colonial Administration, 12; Bishoprics Fund, Jubilee of, 85; Bishops Bill, 14; Church, 14; Church Regulation Bill, 16; Corn, 10; Customs Duties Bill, 8; Education, 6; Government, 13; Matters, Right of Parliament to Interfere in, 12; Passengers Bill, 6; Policy, 19, 31, 43; Possessions, 13; Questions, 62; Sugar, 11; Trade, 8. Cyprus, 59. Defence of the, 50; Clergy Reserves, 15. East India Company, 44. East India—Council of State, 44; Income Tax, 26; Loan Bill, 59; Revenue Accounts, 45, 59; Rum, 8. Egypt, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 88; Soudan, 71, 72. Egyptian Campaign, Expenses of, 71; Loan Bill, 74, 75. Episcopate, 85. Fiji Islands, 49, 51. Gibraltar, 71. Hudson's Bay Company, 13, 20, 22. India, 71, 75; Affairs, 60; Case of Mr. Mason, 45; Contingent, 58; Councils Act Amendment Bill, 86; England's Duty to, 21; Financial Statement, 51; Government Committee, 22; Government of, Bill, 32; Opium Revenue, 88; Oude—Lord Ellenborough's Despatch, 22; Press Law, 57; Revenue, 59; Visit of Prince of Wales, 54. Maltese Marriage Question, 84. Military Co-Operation, 74. New Zealand, 7, 11; Government Bill, 14; Loan Bill, 30; Salary of Bishop of, 20. Preferential Duties, 8; South Africa, 60; South African Federation, 61; State-Aided Emigration, 43. Trans-

- vaal, Annexation of the, 63 ;
- Boer Invasion of Bechuana-  
land, 69 ; Rising, 65. Van-  
couver's Island, 12. Van Die-  
men's Land, 13. West Indian  
Sugar Planters, 7. Zulu War,  
59
- " Colonies, Our," 93
- Colonization, Scientific, 12
- " Colour-sense, The," 98 ; Ger-  
man Translation, 99
- Commerce, Agriculture and, Minis-  
ter of, 64
- Commerce and War, 32
- Commercial and Social Progress, 28
- " Commercial Legislation, Remarks  
upon Recent," 92
- Commercial Policy, 12
- Commercial Treaty with France,  
24, 27, 28, 49, 253-311
- Commercial Treaties, 9, 10, 43
- Commission of the Peace, 35
- Commissions, Permanent Expenses  
of, 38
- Commitment of a Member, 68
- Companies Regulation Bill, Joint  
Stock, 10
- Compensation for Disturbance (Ire-  
land) Bill, 62
- Competition, Foreign, 37
- Competitive Examinations, 19, 27,  
43
- Compounding for Rates, 38
- Compulsory Church Rates Aboli-  
tion Bill, 33, 34, 37
- " Condition of Man in a Future  
Life, On the," 105
- Congé d'élire* Bill, 61
- Congo, River, 69
- Connahs Quay, Speech delivered at,  
79
- Connaught, Duke of, Annuity to,  
47, 58
- " Conservative Collapse," 100
- " Conservative Legacy, The," 100
- Conservative Party and its record,  
40, 87
- Consolidated Annuities (Ireland), 15
- Consolidated Fund Legislation, 10,  
16, 23, 75, 87
- Conspiracy to Murder Bill, 21
- Constitution, Speech against the  
Suspension of the, 7
- Contagious Diseases Acts, 70
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill,  
58
- Controller of the Exchequer Bill, 32
- Conventual and Monastic Institu-  
tions, 43
- Convict Systems, 12
- Conybeare, Mr., 80, 88
- Co-operation, 85
- Coopers' Trade, 10
- Copyright, 8, 9
- Corfu, Speech delivered at, 22, 23
- Cork, Mayor of—Daniel O'Sullivan,  
41
- Corn Laws, 8, 9, 10
- " Correspondence between W. E.  
Gladstone and Mr. Rearden,"  
95
- " Correspondence between Captain  
R. Sprye and W. E. Gladstone  
on the Commercial Opening  
of the Shan States and Western  
Inland China by Railway direct  
from Rangoon," 95
- " Correspondence of John Lothrop  
Motley, 103
- Corrupt Practices at Elections, 36
- Corrupt Practices Bill, 37, 39, 70
- Corstorphine, Speeches delivered  
at, 61, 86
- Cottage Gardens and Fruit Culture,  
82, 84, 90
- " Cottage Gardens and Fruit Cul-  
ture," Address, 102
- " Count Montalembert on Catholic  
Interests in the Nineteenth  
Century," 93
- " Country and the Government,  
The," 99
- County Court Acts Amendment  
Bill, 20
- County Court Judges, 19, 50
- County Government (Ireland) Bill,  
80
- County Franchise Resolution, 49
- " County Franchise and Mr. Lowe  
thereon, The," 98
- " Course of Commercial Policy at  
Home and Abroad " (Anony-  
mous article), 91
- " Courses of Religious Thought,  
The," 97
- " Creation Story, The," 103
- Credit, Votes of, 57, 68, 72, 73, 75
- Crete, Insurrection in, 35
- Crimean War, 19, 54, 55 ; and the  
Navy, 18 ; Commissioners' Re-  
port, 19 ; Treaty of Peace, 19
- Criminal Law Act, 1887, 80

- Criminal Law Amendment (Ireland) Bill, 77, 78  
 Crisis, Monetary (1866), 33  
 Crown Duties, 76  
 Crown Lands, Inclosure of, 28  
 Crown Lands Acts, 33  
 Crown, Prerogative of the, 53  
 Crown Private Estates Bill, 52  
 Croydon, Speech delivered at, 50  
 Cuban Refugees, 70  
 Cumberland Liberal Members, 80  
 Cumberland—Lord-Lieutenant, 41  
 Currency and Banking, 34  
 Customs Act, (1842), 8, 9  
 Customs Act (1853), 16, 24  
 Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, 26, 27, 28, 33, 62, 63, 64, 68, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 312-341  
 "Customs and Inland Revenue Bill," Speech, 94  
 Customs Department, 83  
 Customs Duties, 10, 18  
 Customs Duties Bill, Colonial, 8  
 Customs, Out-door Officers of, 31  
 Cymmrodorian Society, 56  
 Cyprus, 59, 61  
*Daily Chronicle*, The, Mr. Conybeare's Letter to, 88  
 Dalkeith, Speech delivered at, 60, 61, 75, 84, 86  
 Dalmeny, Speech delivered at, 60, 61  
 "Daniel O'Connell," 102  
 Danish Claims, 26  
 Danubian Principalities, 22  
 Davidson's Main, Speech delivered at, 61  
 "Dawn of Creation and of Worship," 101  
 Day of Humiliation, 33  
 "Dean Hook, an Address delivered at Hawarden," 99  
 Deans and Canons Resignation Bill, 48  
 Death Duties, 79, 82  
 Debates—Official Reports, 55  
 Deceased Wife's Sister, Marriage with, 13, 42, 43  
 Declaration of Paris (1856), 46  
 "Declining Efficiency of Parliament, The," 93  
 "Dedfrydau Llys y Pab yn eu heffaith ar deyrngarwch gwladol : ymresymiad gwleidyddol . . . Wedi ei gyfieithu . . . gan R. J. Pryse," 97  
 Dee Ironworks, Chester, Speech delivered at, 84  
 "Defence of Free Trade, A," 103  
 Denison, Speaker, 48  
 Denmark, 29, 30  
 Derby Day, 49  
 Derby, Speech delivered at, 79  
 Designs Copyright Bill, 9  
 Devonport Election, 33  
 "Did Dante Study in Oxford?" 104  
 Dilke, Sir Charles, 49  
 Dillon, Mr., 78  
 Dingwall, Speech delivered at, 16  
 Diplomatic Service, 28, 41  
 "Discorso di W. E. Gladstone intorno a G. Garibaldi, Il [2nd June, 1883]. Tradotto in Italiano," 100  
 Diocesan Spiritual Help Society, 21  
 Disestablishment : Church of England, 47, 51, 61, 75 ; "Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church, Motion for the," Speech, 96 ; Church of Ireland, 39, 40 ; Church of Scotland, 76, 83 ; Church of Wales, 44, 51  
 Disraeli, Mr., *see* Beaconsfield, Lord  
 Dissenters' Chapels Bill, 10  
 "Dissenters' Chapels Bills, The," Speech, 91  
 Divorce Bill, 21  
 "Divorce—a Novel," 102  
 Dock Strike, 82  
 "Domestic and Foreign Affairs," Speech, 100  
 Domestic Legislation, Neglect of, 61  
 "Dominions of Odysseus, and the Island Group of the Odyssey, The," 98  
 Dover, Speech delivered at, 79  
 Double-Chamber Constitutions, 13  
 "Dr. Döllinger," 103  
 "Dr. Döllinger's Posthumous Remains," 103  
 Dublin, Freedom of, 56  
 Dublin, Speech delivered at, 56  
 "Duel, A. Free Trade—the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Protection—the Hon. J. G. Blaine," 103  
 "Duke of Argyll's *Presbytery Examined*," 92  
 Dundee, Speeches delivered at, 84  
 Dunfermline, Speech delivered at, 60

Dunkeld, Speech delivered at, 60  
 Durham, Bishops of London and,  
     Retirement Bill, 20  
 Durham Liberal Members, 78

East, Excavation in the, 50  
 "Eastern Crisis, The. A letter to  
     the Duke of Westminster," 105  
 Eastern Question, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59,  
     60, 61, 470-504, 505-552  
 "Eastern Question, Resolutions and  
     Speech on the," 98

East India Company, 44  
 East India Council of State, 44 ;  
     Income Tax, 26 ; Loan Bill, 59 ;  
     Revenue Accounts, 45, 59 ;  
     Rum, 8

"Ecce Homo," 95

Ecclesiastical: Benefices in Plu-  
 rality Bill, 13 ; Bishopric of  
 Bristol Bill, 73 ; Bishops  
 (Scotland), 20 ; Bishops of  
 London and Durham Retirement  
 Bill, 20 ; Bishops' Resig-  
 nation Bill, 42 ; Canada Bill,  
 15 ; Cathedrals and Collegiate  
 Churches, 12 ; Church Rates,  
 7, 12 ; Church Rates Abolition  
 Bill, 18, 22, 25, 33, 35 ; Church  
 Patronage (Scotland) Bill, 51,  
 53 ; Church Reform (Ireland)  
 Bill, 6 ; Clergy, Condition of  
 the, 90 ; Clergy Discipline  
 (Immorality) Bill, 86 ; Clergy  
 Relief Bill, 12 ; Clergy Re-  
 serves, 15 ; Clergy Reserves  
 (Canada) Bill, 8 ; Clerical Pro-  
 fession, 85 ; Colonial Bishops  
 Bill, 14 ; Colonial Church Re-  
 gulation Bill, 16 ; Colonial  
 Episcopate, 85 ; Commission,  
 67 ; Commission Bill, 13 ;  
 Compulsory Church Rates Abo-  
 lition Bill, 33, 34, 37 ; Con-  
 ventual and Monastic Institu-  
 tions, 43 ; Courts and Regis-  
 tries Bill, 50 ; Deans and  
 Canons Resignation Bill, 48 ;  
 Diocesan Spiritual Help  
 Society, 21 ; Disestablishment  
 (Church of England), 47, 51,  
 61, 75, 86 ; Disestablishment  
 (Church of Ireland), 38, 39, 40 ;  
 Disestablishment (Church of  
 Scotland), 76, 83 ; Dissenters'

Chapels Bill, 10 ; Duties and  
 Revenues Bill, 8 ; "Ecclesi-  
 astical Duties and Reve-  
 nues," Speech, 91 ; Episcopal  
 Revenues, 11 ; Ewelme, Rec-  
 tory of, 48 ; Foreign Mis-  
 sionary Society, 20 ; Frome  
 Vicarage, 14 ; Ireland, Church  
 of, *see also* Disestablishment,  
 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 380-400 ;  
 Lords' Spiritual Bill, 44 ; Malt-  
 ese Marriage Question, 84 ;  
 Marriage with Deceased Wife's  
 Sister Bill, 42 ; New Zealand,  
 Salary of Bishop of, 20 ; Ob-  
 servance Bill, 6 ; Occasional  
 Sermons Bill, 51 ; Patronage  
 of Benefices (Church of Eng-  
 land), 63 ; Positive Religious  
 Teaching, 49 ; Prisons, Speech  
 against Appointment of Dis-  
 senting Chaplains, 7 ; Public  
 Worship Regulation Bill, 53  
 Religious Denominations (Scot-  
 land), 58 ; Religious Disabili-  
 ties Removal Bill, 85 ; Religi-  
 ous Worship Bill, 24 ; Revenue  
 of the Church of England, 50 ;  
 Roman Relief Bill, 11 ; Rome,  
 Diplomatic relations with, 12 ;  
 Scotland, Church of, *see also*  
 Disestablishment, 20, 51, 53,  
 58, 70, 83 ; Society for Pro-  
 pagation of the Gospel, 20, 21 ;  
 Suffragan Bishops, 43 ; Tithes  
 and Church (Ireland) Bill, 6 ;  
 Welsh Church, 44, 87

Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption  
 Bill, 13, 14

"Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption  
 Bill," Speech, 92

Economy, Plea for, 32 ; Economy  
 in Public Expenditure, 57.

Edinburgh, Duke of, 32, 33, 38, 52  
 Edinburgh, History of Market Cross,  
 75

Edinburgh, Speeches delivered at,  
 27, 60, 61, 73, 75, 77, 84, 86, 89

Edinburgh University, Address to,  
 32

Education, 7, 14, 15, 20, 21, 25,  
 37, 54, 56, 58, 59, 71 ; Chris-  
 tian Aspect of, 27 ; in the  
 Colonies, 6 ; Elementary Edu-  
 cation Act Amendment Bill, 52 ;  
 Elementary Education Bill, 43,

- 44, 45 ; Endowed Schools Bill, 23 ; Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill, 53 ; English and Irish Universities, 13 ; English Public Schools, 54 ; Higher Education, 56 ; Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, 58 ; Intermediate Education (Wales) Bill, 81 ; Manchester Education Bill, 14 ; Medical, 55 ; Middle Class, 27 ; Minister of Education, 70 ; National, 10 ; National (Ireland), 30 ; Oxford and Cambridge Education Bill, 36 ; of the Poor Bill, 37 ; Positive Religious Teaching, 49 ; Public Schools Bill, 37 ; Religious, 8 ; Religious Teaching in Elementary Schools, 44 ; School Boards, 52 ; Science and Art Estimate, 27 ; University Education (Ireland) Bill, 32, 50, 59 ; Wales, 59 ; of Women, 84
- Egan, Mr. P., 64
- Egypt, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 88 ; Soudan, 71, 72
- "Egypt and the Soudan," Speech, 100
- Egyptian Loan Bill, 74, 75
- Eighty Club, Speeches delivered at, 73, 77
- Eisteddfod, Wrexham, Speech delivered at, 81
- Elections Bill, 46, 47
- Elections, Corrupt Practices at, 36
- Elections : Devonport, 33 ; East Worcestershire, 39 ; Parliamentary and Municipal, 40, 41, 44, 48, 49 ; Tipperary, 42
- Elective Franchise Bill, 33
- Elector, Abduction of an, 7
- "Electoral Facts," 79
- "Electoral Facts, No. III," 104
- "Electoral Facts of 1887," 102
- "Electoral Facts of To-day," 103
- Electoral Power, Distribution of, 51
- Electoral Statistics, 33
- Elementary Education Act, 43, 44, 45
- Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill, 52
- Electric Telegraphs Bill, 39
- "Elizabethan Settlement of Religion, The," 102
- Ellenborough, Lord, 22
- "Ellen Middleton" (Review), 91, 103
- Elliott, Sir Henry, 55
- Emanuel Hospital Scheme, 51
- Emigration, 43
- Employers' Liability Bill, 61, 62, 90
- Endowed Schools Bill, 23
- Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill, 53
- England's Duty to Ireland, 39
- "England's Mission," 99
- English and Irish Universities, 13
- "English Church under Henry the Eighth, The," 103
- English Commerce and Foreign Competition, 45
- English People, The, 90
- English Public Schools, 54
- Ennis, Disturbance at, 79
- Entail, Law of, 49, 64
- Episcopal Revenues, 11
- "Epithets of Movement in Homer, On," 99
- Epping Forest, 42
- Errington, Sir G., 84
- Established Churches, *see* Ecclesiastical
- Estate, Real, Intestacy Bill, 41
- Eton, Speeches delivered at, 10, 58, 59, 85
- "Eton Miscellany," Vol. I. By Bartholomew Bouverie (i.e. W. E. Gladstone), 91
- "Eton Translations, Some," 104
- Euphrates Valley Railway, 21
- European Armaments, 62
- European Concert, 55
- "Evangelical Movement, its Parentage, Progress, and Issue, The," 99
- Evictions (Ireland), 63
- Ewelme, Rectory of, 48
- Exchequer Bills, 16, 19, 23, 26, 27, 32
- Exchequer Bonds, 17, 22, 54
- Exchequer Loan Fund, 15
- Exeter, Speech delivered at, 56
- Exhibition Buildings, 29
- Exportation of Machinery, 9
- Expenditure, Extravagance of National, 31
- Eyre, Governor, 47
- Factory Boy Appointments, 25
- Factory System, 31
- Falcarragh, Police at, 81
- Falmouth, Speech delivered at, 82

- "Farini's *Stato Romano*," 93
- Farmers' Estate Society (Ireland) Bill, 12
- "Faticaniaeth; atteb i geryddon ac attebion . . . Wedi ei gyfieithu . . . gan R. J. Pryse," 94
- Fawcett, Mr., 47
- Female Suffrage, 44, 47, 72
- "Female Suffrage," 104
- Fenianism, 32, 37, 56
- Fiji Islands, 49, 51, 53
- Financial Policy, 15, 18, 20, 23, 27, 31, 32, 59, 61, 75, 88
- "Finance of the Year and the Treaty of Commerce with France, Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the," 94
- "Financial Budget for 1854," 93
- Financial Statements, 15, 17, 19, 24, 25, 36, 38, 53, 57, 59, 60, 62, 69, 155-181, 253-311
- Financial Statement—India, 51
- "Financial Statements of 1853, 1860-1863," 94
- "Financial Statement, 1857, The," Speech in Committee of Supply, 93
- "Financial Statement," Speech, 1862, 94
- "Financial Statement of 1864," 94
- "Financial Statement of 1865," 95
- "Financial State and Prospects of the Country, Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the," 93
- Financial Proposals (Abyssinian War), 37; (War with China), 26
- Fire Insurance, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35
- Florence*, Seizure of the, 69
- "'For the Right,'" 102
- Foreign Cattle Trade, 39
- Foreign Competition, 37, 45
- Foreign Embassies, 81
- Foreign Labour, 87
- Foreign Missionary Society, 20
- Foreign Office, Speech delivered at, 70
- Foreign Policy, 20, 28, 31, 34, 45, 46, 48, 62, 65, 75, 83
- "Foreign Policy of Government, Speech on," 99
- Forestry, Select Committee, 75
- Formularies of Faith, Subscription to, 29
- Forster, Mr., 67, 76
- Fortifications Bill, 34
- France, 45, 46
- "France and the Late Ministry," 94
- France and Tunis, 64
- France: Financial Conference—Egypt, 73; General Tariff, 64, 65; Government, 17; on a good understanding with, 24; Revolutionary Tribunals, 17; Treaty with, 27; Treaty of Commerce, 24, 27, 49, 253-311
- Franco-German War, 45
- Franchise Bill, 71, 73, 74
- "Franchise Bill, The," Speech, 100
- Franchise Bill, Elective, 33
- Franchise, Parliamentary, 85
- Franchise, Rural, Extension of the 49
- Franchise in Towns, Extension of, 30
- Free Libraries, 85
- Free Trade, 12, 14, 15, 16, 32, 35, 65, 75, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85
- "Free Trade, Railways, and the Growth of Commerce," 99
- "Friends and Foes of Russia, The," 99
- Friendly Societies, 24, 58
- "From Oxford to Rome," 92
- Frome Vicarage, 14
- Fruit, Cultivation of, 81, 82, 84
- Fund, Consolidated, Appropriation Bill, 23
- Funded Debt Bill, 22
- Fund, Exchequer Loan, 15
- "Further Notes and Queries on the Irish Demand," 102
- "Future of English - Speaking Races, The," 102
- "Future Life and the Condition of Man therein, The," 104
- Galway Mail Contract, 23; Postal Contract, 26
- Gardening, 55, 60
- Garibaldi, 30, 70
- Garston, Speech delivered at, 40
- Germany, 29, 30, 45, 46; Anglo-German Agreement Bill, 84; Emperor of, 51; Emperor of, Death of, 80
- "Germany, France, and England," 95
- Germany, War with France, 45
- "Giacomo Leopardi," 92
- Gibraltar, 70
- Gillingham, Speech delivered at, 82

- Gilmerton, Speech delivered at, 61  
 Gladstone Library, 80  
 Gladstone, Sir Thomas, 6  
 Glasgow, Freedom of, 32  
 Glasgow, Speeches delivered at, 7,  
 8, 24, 32, 60, 77, 86  
 Glasgow University, Addresses to,  
 24, 60  
 "Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78  
 [*sic*]," 99  
 Glebe Loan (Ireland) Act, 45, 47  
 Glenalmond College, Speeches de-  
 livered at, 21, 85  
 Gordon, General, 72, 73  
 Gorebridge, Speeches delivered at,  
 61, 86  
 Goschen, Mr., 32, 78, 85  
 Gough, Viscount, 45  
 Government Annuities Bill, 29, 30  
 Government and Class Interests, 61  
 Grahamstown, Speech delivered at,  
 73  
 Grain Bill, Weighing of (Port of  
 London), 30  
 Gray, M.P., Mr. Dwyer, 68  
 "Great Olympian Sedition, The,"  
 102  
 "Greater Gods of Olympus, The,"  
 101-102  
 "Great Physician; The," 104  
 Greece, 13, 30, 55, 109-154; British  
 Payments to, 41; King of,  
 Annuity to, 30; Murder of  
 British Subjects, 44, 45  
 Greece in the Providential Order  
 of the World, the Place of  
 Ancient, 32  
 "Greece and the Treaty of Berlin,"  
 99  
 Greenwich, Speeches delivered at,  
 54, 58  
 "Greenwich, A Collected Report  
 of the Speech . . . at, 96  
 Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland)  
 Bill, 32, 34  
 Hamilton, Speech delivered at, 60  
 Hampstead, Speech delivered at, 80  
 Harbours of Refuge, 46  
 Hartington, Lord, 78  
 Harvey, Mr., 48  
 Havelock, Pension to Sir Henry, 21  
 Hawarden, Speeches delivered at,  
 19, 28, 37, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57,  
 58, 59, 60, 66, 71, 77, 78, 79,  
 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90  
 Helena, Princess, Public Grant, 32  
 "Hellenic Factor in the Eastern  
 Problem, The," 97  
 Hendon, Speech delivered at, 77  
 Herbert, Lord, 35  
 Highways, 63  
 "History of 1852-1860 and Gre-  
 ville's Latest Journals," 101  
 Holyhead, Speech delivered at, 57  
 Home and Foreign Labour, 87  
 Home Missions, 59  
 Home Rule, *see* Ireland, 48, 49, 53,  
 66, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84,  
 85, 86, 88, 601, 644; Scotland,  
 78, 81, 84, 86; Wales, 78, 81  
 "Home Rule, Manifesto," Address,  
 101  
 Homer, 58, 59  
 "Homer. . .," 99  
 "Homer," 103  
 Homer and Assyrian Mythology, 83  
 "Homer and the Homeric Age,  
 Studies on," 94  
 "Homer and his Successors in  
 Epic Poetry," 93  
 "Homer's Place in History," 96  
 Homeric Artemis, 85  
 "Homeric Characters in and out  
 of Homer," 93  
 "The Homeric Herê," 102  
 "Homeric Synchronism: an En-  
 quiry into the Time and Place  
 of Homer," 97; German  
 Translation, 98  
 "Homorology," Vols. I, II, III, IV, 97  
 Hook, Dr., 59  
 Hop Duties, 15, 26  
 Horfield Estate, The, 14  
 Houses of Parliament, New, 33  
 House, Rules of the, *see* Procedure  
 Hudson's Bay Company, 13, 20, 22  
 Huddersfield, Liberal Deputation  
 from, 90  
 Hume, Mr., 34  
 Humiliation, Day of, 33  
 Hyde Park, Proposed Reform  
 Meeting in, 36  
 "Hymnus responsorius," 96  
 Iddesleigh, Lord, 27, 53, 77  
 "Ideal of a Christian Church, The,"  
 92  
 "Impeachment of English Rule in  
 Ireland, An," 101  
 Imperial Parliament, Irish Members  
 in, 87

# INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS 655

- Imperial Revenue**, 76  
**Imperial Taxation**, 92  
**Import Duties**, 9, 15  
**Importation Bill**, 8, 9  
 "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture, The," 103  
**Inclosure of Crown Lands**, 28  
**Income Tax**, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30  
**India**, 60, 71, 75; **Army of**, 22; **Contingent**, 58; **Councils Act Amendment Bill**, 86; **England's Duty to**, 21; **Government of India Bill**, 22; **Government Committee**, 22; **Mason, Case of Mr.**, 45; **Opium Revenue**, 59; **Oude**, 22; **Press Law**, 57, 58; **Revenue**, 59; **Visit of Prince of Wales**, 54;  
**Indirect Claims (United States)**, 48, 49  
**Industrial Progress**, 84  
**Industry and Art**, 89  
 "Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, On the," 98  
 "Ingram's History of the Irish Union," 102  
**Inhabited House Duty Bill**, 14  
**Inland Revenue**, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 44, 54, 62, 63, 64, 68, 70, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 312, 341  
**Innerleithen**, Speech delivered at, 61  
**Insurance, Fire**, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35  
**Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill**, 58  
**Intermediate Education (Wales) Bill**, 81  
**International Law**, 51, 52  
**International Monetary Conference**, 87  
**Intestacy Bill, Real Estate**, 41  
**Intoxicating Liquors (Licences)**, 60, 62  
 "Introduction to the People's Bible History, An," 104  
**Introductory letter to M. de Laveleye's "Protestantism and Catholicism in their bearing upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations,"** 96  
**Inverness**, Speech delivered at, 16  
**Ionian Islands**, 22, 23, 26, 29, 30, 31  
**Ireland**, 6, 29, 31, 37, 55, 56, 62, 65, 67, 69, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85; **Academical Institutions**, 11; **Address from Women of Ireland**, 77; **Administration**, 74; **Administration of Law**, 85; **Arrears of Rent Bill**, 67, 68; **Balfour's Administration, Mr.**, 81; **Bank Notes Bill**, 33; **Bank of Ireland Bill**, 31; **Chancellor of**, 23; **Church**, 6; **Church Bill**, 41, 380-400; **Church Bill, Lords Amendments**, 42; **Church Establishment**, 31; **Church Disestablishment**, 38, 39, 40; **Civil Service**, 52, 81; **Clergy, Future Status of**, 41; **Compensation for Disturbance Bill**, 62; **Conciliatory Measures**, 81; **Condition of**, 37, 42; **Conduct of the Executive**, 87; **Conduct of Police**, 84; **Consolidated Annuities**, 15; **County Government Bill**, 80; **Crime**, 67; **Criminal Law Act (1887)**, 80; **Criminal Law Amendment Bill**, 77; **Dublin, Freedom of**, 56; **England and Irish Universities**, 13; **England's Duty towards**, 39; **Ennis Disturbance at**, 79; **Established Church**, 36, 39, 41, 380-400; **Established Church Bill**, 40; **Evictions**, 63; **Executive**, 65; **Farmers' Estate Society Bill**, 12; **Fenianism**, 32, 37, 56; **Galway Mail, Contract**, 23; **Galway Postal Contract**, 26; **Glebe Loans Act**, 48; **Glebe Loans Bill**, 45; **Government of Ireland Bill**, 76, 87, 88, 89, 601-644; "Government of Ireland Bill, The Reply," 101; "Government of Ireland Bill," The Speech, 101; **Habeas Corpus Suspension Bill**, 32, 34; **Home Rule**, 48, 49, 53, 66, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 86, 88, 601-644; **Imperial Revenue**, 76, **Income Tax**, 15; **Intermediate Education Bill**, 58; **Land Legislation**, 34, 43, 44, 47, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 76, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85; **League**, 79; **Land Purchase Bill**, 81, 84, 85; **Land Purchase Scheme**, 76; **Local Government Bill**, 86; **Maintenance of Social Order**, 76;

- Medical Officers in Unions, 31 ;  
 Ministerial Statement (1882),  
 67 ; Mitchelstown Riot, 79 ;  
 Maynooth College, 7, 11, 14 ;  
 Municipalities, 57 ; National  
 Education, 30 ; National  
 League, 79 ; Parnell, Mr., 65, 66,  
 83, 84 ; Parnell Commission, 80,  
 83 ; Parnellism and Crime, 78 ;  
 Peace Preservation Bill, 43, 64 ;  
 Police Methods, 79 ; Political  
 Prisoners, 43 ; Postage, 41 ;  
 Prevention of Crime Bill, 67,  
 68 ; Proposals of the Irish  
 Party, 75 ; Protection of Life,  
 etc. Bill, 47 ; Protection of  
 Person and Property Bill, 63,  
 64, 66 ; Public Houses, 75 ;  
 Railways, 31, 34, 37, 47, 51, 66 ;  
 Representation of Ireland, 37,  
 39 ; Retention of Irish Mem-  
 bers, 84, 89 ; Riots in Phoenix  
 Park, 48 ; Roman Catholics,  
 35, 69 ; Roman Catholics Re-  
 lief Act Amendment, 23 ; Royal  
 Irish Constabulary, 84 ; Sale  
 of Intoxicating Liquors on  
 Sunday Bill, 53, 55, 72 ; State  
 of Ireland, 38, 41 ; Suspension  
 of Members, 68 ; Taxation of,  
 15, 29 ; Tenants' Relief Bill,  
 77 ; Tenure of Band Bill, 34 ;  
 Tenure of Town Houses Bill,  
 76 ; Tipperary Election, 42 ;  
 Tipperary Trials, 85 ; Tithes  
 and Church Bill, 6 ; Trinity  
 College, Dublin, 36, 43 ; Ulster,  
 77, 86 ; University Education  
 Bill, 32, 50, 59, 426-469 ;  
 University Tests (Dublin) Bill,  
 47, 49, 51 ; Universities Bill,  
 82 ; Unlawful Assemblies Bill,  
 49 ; West Meath—Ribandism,  
 46  
 " Irish Church, The," Speech, 95  
 " Irish Land Bill, The," Speeches,  
 100  
 " Irish Question in 1886," Speeches,  
 101  
 " Irish Question, The," 101  
 " Iris of Homer, The: and her  
 Relation to Genesis ix. 11-17,"  
 99  
 " Is the Church of England worth  
 Preserving ? " 96  
 Isle of Man Constitution, 58  
 Isle of Man, Speeches delivered at,  
 58  
 Italy, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34 ;  
 " Italy in 1888-89," 102 ;  
 Alleged Outrage on Mr. G. G.  
 W. Taylor, 27 ; Capture of  
 the *Cagliari*, 21 ; " Italy and  
 her Church," 96  
 Jamaica, 69  
 Jews in Russia, Persecution of, 66  
 Jews, Speech in favour of admission  
 to Parliament, 11  
 Jewish Disabilities, 8, 11  
 " Jewish Disabilities, Substance of  
 a Speech on the Motion of  
 Lord John Russell for a Com-  
 mittee of the whole House,  
 with a view to the removal  
 of the remaining," 92  
 Joint Stock Companies Regulation  
 Bill, 10  
 " Journal de Marie Bashkirtseff,"  
 103  
 Judges and Chancellors, 19  
 Judges, County Court, 19, 50  
 Judicature, Supreme Court of, 51,  
 52, 54  
 Judicial Committee of the Privy  
 Council, 48  
 Juniper Green, Speech delivered  
 at, 61  
 " Juventus Mundi. The Gods and  
 Men of the Heroic Age," 95  
 Greek Translation, 99  
 Kaffir War, 7, 14  
 Keogh, Mr. Justice, 50  
 Kennedy, Rt. Hon. T. F., 18  
 Kennington, New Writ for, 81  
 Kertch and Yenikale Prize Money,  
 27  
 Kew Gardens, 50  
 " Kin beyond Sea," 99  
 King, M.P., Mr. Locke, 50  
 Kirkwall, Speech delivered at, 71  
 Knowledge, 55, 60  
 Knowsley, Speech delivered at, 65  
 Knox, M.P., Mr. E. F. V., 90  
 Labouchere, Mr., 74, 83  
 Labour Questions, 37, 39, 80, 81, 85  
 Labourers Conference, 85  
 " Lachmann's Ilias," 92  
 Lacour, M. Chattemel, 62  
 Lancashire Distress, 28

- Lancashire Liberals, 80
- Lands Acts, Crown, 33
- Lands and Buildings, Public, 30
- Land, Entailment of, 49
- Land and "Fair Trade" 65
- Land Legislation for Ireland, 34, 43, 44, 47, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 76, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85
- Land Reform, 75
- Land Tax Redemption Act Amendment Bill, 16
- "Landmarks of Homeric Study," 103
- Last Speech, 90
- "Last Words on the County Franchise," 98
- Larbert, Speech delivered at, 73
- "Later Gleanings: a new Series of Gleanings of Past Years. Theological and Ecclesiastical," 105
- Launcester, Speech delivered at, 82
- "Lavelle v. Proudfoot," 42
- Law Courts, New, 42
- Law, General School of, 48
- Law and Lawyers, 31
- Lawley, Appointment of Mr., 18
- "Laymen in the Church, A Letter to . . . W. Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen . . . on the Functions of," 93
- "Lecky's History of England in the Eighteenth Century," 102
- Leeds, Liberal Deputations from, 71, 90
- Leeds, Speeches delivered at, 65
- Legacy Duties, 15
- Legal Reforms, 50
- Leigh, Speech delivered at, 40
- Leith Council, Deputation of, 60
- Le Marchant, Sir Denis, 45
- Leopold, Prince, Grant to, 53, 66
- Lesseps, M. de, 71
- "Lessons of Irish History in the Eighteenth Century," 102
- "Lessons in Massacre," 98
- "Letter explaining a sentence in the article in the February number," *Nineteenth Century*, 104
- "Letter on Evolution," 96
- "Letter on Newman and Wesley," 97
- Lewis, Sir G. C., 18, 20
- "Letter to R. Bosworth Smith on Disestablishment, October 31, 1885," 101
- "Letter to Governor and Deputy of Bank of England and Governor's reply," 94
- Liberal Party, Organization and Record, 40, 57, 58, 61, 81, 82, 85, 86
- Liberal Unionism, 77, 81, 83
- Liberals, Dissident, 82
- Libraries, Free, 85
- Libraries, Use of, 90
- "Liberty in the East and West," 99
- Licensing Question, 24, 25, 27, 38, 60, 62, 83, 84
- "Life of Bishop Patteson," 76
- "Life of the Prince Consort," 98
- "Life and Speeches of the Prince Consort. Court of Queen Victoria," 96
- "Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White," 92
- Limehouse, Speeches delivered at, 81
- Lincoln Divorce Case, 21
- Linlithgow, Speech delivered at, 61
- Liquors, Sale of, On Sunday Bill, 38
- Literature, 59
- Liverpool and Bribery, 6
- Liverpool College, Speech delivered at, 50
- "Liverpool Collegiate Institution, Inaugural Address," 91
- "Liverpool Collegiate Institution, Address delivered at the Distribution of Prizes in the," 96
- Liverpool Election Petition, 6
- Liverpool, Freedom of, 87
- Liverpool and Manchester Ship Canal, 87
- Liverpool Operatives' Conservative Association, 7
- Liverpool, Speeches delivered at, 7, 8, 9, 20, 21, 22, 27, 31, 32, 33, 40, 77, 87, 90
- Liverpool Tradesmen's Conservative Association, 7
- Loan Bill, East India, 59
- Loan Bill, New Zealand, 30
- Loan, Canada, 35, 51
- Loan, Egypt, 74, 75
- Loans, Glebe (Ireland) Bill, 45
- Loanhead, Speech delivered at, 61
- Local Government (England and Wales), 79, 80, 89, 90
- Local Government (Ireland), 86
- Local Government (Scotland), 82
- Local and Imperial Taxation, 72
- Local Option, 70

- Local Self-Government, 85  
 Local Taxation, 40, 43, 46, 50, 66,  
 70, 83, 84, 85  
 " ' Locksley Hall,' and the Jubilee,"  
 101  
 London Corporation, 77  
 London and Durham, Bishops of,  
 Retirement Bill, 20  
 London Government Bill, 73  
 London, Speeches delivered in, 31,  
 \* 35, 37, 38, 57, 58, 66, 70, 73, 77,  
 78, 79, 80, 85, 90; Agricultural  
 Hall, 89; American Thanks-  
 giving Dinner, 50; Archbishop  
 Tenison's Grammar School, 27;  
 Burlington School, 84; Cax-  
 ton Exhibition, 50; City  
 Temple, 55; Conference of  
 London Nonconformist Minis-  
 ters, 57; Congress of Oriental-  
 ists, 87; Cobden Club (In-  
 augural Meeting), 34; Fish-  
 mongers' Hall, 40; Gros-  
 venor House, 55; Guy's Hos-  
 pital, 83; Holborn Restaurant,  
 85; House of Charity, Soho,  
 54; Institute of Civil En-  
 gineers, 57; Kings College,  
 49, 55; Liberal and Rad-  
 ical Union, 78, 86; London  
 Hospital Medical College, 55;  
 London Institution, 56; Man-  
 sion House, 15, 17, 42, 45,  
 48, 50, 51, 52, 62, 65, 69,  
 71; Merchant Taylors Hall,  
 39; Middle Temple, 50; Myd-  
 dleton, Sir Hugh, unveiling of  
 Statue of, 28; National Liberal  
 Club, 70, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84;  
 Prince's Hall, Piccadilly, 83;  
 Royal Literary Fund Dinner,  
 23; St. James's Hall, 55;  
 St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, 11,  
 12; St. Martin's Lane Public  
 Library, 85; St. Pancras  
 Workhouse, 60; Savage  
 Club, 59; Savings Bank  
 Depositors, 84; Social Science  
 Association, 39; Society of  
 Antiquaries, 55; Society of  
 Biblical Archæology, 50; Staf-  
 ford, House, 70; Trades  
 Unions, 37; Willis's Rooms,  
 27, 53, 56, 59, 73; Workmen's  
 International Exhibition, 45  
 Lord Privy Seal, Office of, 45  
 " Lord John Russell's Translation  
 of the Francesca da Rimini," 91  
 " Lord Macaulay," 97  
 " Lord's Day, The," 104  
 Lord's Day Observance Bill, 6  
 Lord's Spiritual Bill, 44  
 Lords, House of: Amendment  
 Ballot Bill, 49; Amendments  
 to Irish Church Bill, 42;  
 Amendments to Representa-  
 tion of the People Bill, 37;  
 Appellate Jurisdiction, 52;  
 Bishops in, 44; Home Rule  
 Bill, 89; Interference with  
 Supply Bills, 25; Pensions of  
 Officers of, 31; Reform of, 74;  
 Rejection of Franchise Bill, 73  
 Louise, Princess, Dowry and An-  
 nuity of, 45  
 " Love Odes of Horace," 104  
 Lowe, Mr., 33  
 Lowestoft, Speech delivered at, 83  
 Luggacurran Evictions, 82  
 " Lyttelton, Biographical Sketch  
 of George William, fourth  
 Lord," 97  
 Machinery, 37  
 McKinley Tariff, 84  
 Maiden Speech, 6  
 Malt for Cattle Bill, 29  
 Malt Duties, 16, 25, 27, 30, 32, 33,  
 36, 43  
 Malta, 58  
 Malversation, Charges of—London  
 Corporation, 77  
 Manchester, City of, 83  
 Manchester Education Bill, 14  
 Manchester, Fenian Convicts at, 37  
 Manchester, Ship Canal, 87  
 Manchester, Speeches delivered at,  
 7, 16, 27, 31, 32, 36, 77, 83  
 " Manual of Prayers for the  
 Liturgy. Arranged for Family  
 use," 92  
 Manufacturing Towns and the  
 Universities, 21  
 Marlborough College, Speech de-  
 livered at, 55  
 Marriage Law Amendment, 18  
 Marriage Question, Maltese, 84  
 Marriage with Deceased Wife's  
 Sister Bill, 42, 43  
 Mary of Cambridge, Princess, 34  
 Mason, Mr. (India), 45

# INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS 659

- "Massacres in Turkey," 105
- Matabeleland, 89
- Maxwell, Commander Heron, 71
- May, Sir Thomas Erskine, 76
- Maynooth College, 7, 11, 14
- "Maynooth College Bill Speech," 92
- Mayo, Lady, 49
- "Mechanics Institutes : their Advantages and how to Improve them. A Lecture," 94
- Medical Education, 55
- Medical Officers in Union (Ireland), 31
- Medical Profession, 83
- Mediterranean, 68
- Magaera*, Loss of the, 47
- "Melbourne Government, The : its Acts and Persons," 103
- Members, Charges against, 80
- Members, Payment of, 43, 80, 81
- "Memoir of John Murray," 104
- "Memoir of Norman Macleod, D.D.," 97
- "Memorials of a Southern Planter," 103
- Men and Women, Protest against Unequal Treatment of, 21
- Mental Culture, 54
- Mentmore, Speech delivered at, 59
- Metropolis : Local Management Act Amendment Bill, 22
- Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market Bill, 39
- Merchant Shipping Code Bill, 44
- Merchants and Factors Bill, 8
- Merchant Seamen and Pilots, 13
- Mid Calder, Speech delivered at, 61
- Middle Class Education, 27
- Middlesbrough, Speech delivered at, 28
- "Midlothian Speeches . . . 1885," 101
- Military Co-operation of the Colonies, 74
- Military Forces of the Crown, 57
- Military Forces Localization Bill, 50
- Military Operations, Expenses of, 60
- Mill Hill School, Speech delivered at, 59
- Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, 88
- "Ministerial Explanation, The, 20 March, 1873," 96
- "Ministry and the Sugar Duties, The," Speech, 91
- "Missionary Speech, Chester," 94
- Mitchelstown Riots, 79
- "Modern 'Symposium,' A," 99
- Mold, Speeches delivered at, 20, 28, 31, 52
- Monastic Institutions, Conventual and, 43
- Monetary Conference, International, 87
- Monetary Crisis (1866), 33
- "Montenegro. A Sketch," 98
- "Mosaic Legislation, The," 103
- Motherwell, Speech delivered at, 60
- "Mr. Carnegie's 'Gospel of Wealth' : a Review and a Recommendation," 103
- "Mr. Forster and Ireland," 102
- "Mr. Lecky and Political Morality," 102
- Municipal Bodies, 51
- Municipal Corporations Bill, 6
- Municipal Elections Bill, 40, 41, 48, 49
- Municipal Life, 56
- Murder Bill, Conspiracy to, 21
- "Musæ Etonenses (Series Nova), 1869," 95
- Music, 90
- Mycenæ, Excavations of, 55
- Myddleton, Sir Hugh, Unveiling of Statue, 28
- Naples, Commerce with, 29
- Napoleon, Prince Louis, 62
- National Debt, 18, 22, 36, 47, 71, 79
- National Education, 19
- National Education (Ireland), 30
- National Expenditure, 31, 46, 59, 68, 70
- "National Expenditure 1883," Speech, 100
- National Liberal Federation, 81, 83, 85
- National Prosperity, 37
- National University, 22
- Nature, Study of, 85
- Naval Defence, 81
- Naval Retirement, 43
- Navy and the Crimean War, 18
- Navy Estimates, 21, 33, 35, 41, 50, 69
- Navigation Bill, 12
- Navigation Laws, 11, 12
- Navigation Laws—Russia, 10
- "Neapolitan Government, Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Prosecution of the, etc.," 92, 93 ; Italian Translation, 93

- "Neapolitan Government, An Examination of the Official Reply of the," 93  
 Negro Apprenticeship, 6, 7  
 "Nelda, a Romance," translated from Grossi, 94  
 Neutral Vessels, 45  
 Neutrality, 23  
 New Caledonia, 22  
 New Cross, Speech delivered at, 52  
 "New Parliament and its Work, The," 13  
 New Zealand, 7, 11  
 "New Zealand Constitution Bill, Speech . . . on the Second Reading of the," 93  
 — Government Bill, 14  
 — Salary of Bishop of, 20  
 — Loan Bill, 30  
 Newark, Mr. Gladstone retires from representation of, 11  
 Newark, Speeches delivered at, 6, 7  
 Newcastle, Duke of, 32  
 Newcastle-on-Tyne, Speech delivered at, 28, 85  
 Newport Market Refuge, 53  
 Newspaper Stamps, 16, 18  
 Newton, Speech delivered at, 40  
*Nineteenth Century*, The, 58  
*Nisero*, Crew of the, 73  
 Nonconformist Ministers, 80  
 Nonconformists, Address to, 86  
 Northampton, New writ for, 63, 66  
 Northcote, Mr. and Mr. Biggar, 65  
 Northcote, Sir Stafford, *see* Iddesleigh, Lord  
 Northbrook, Lord, 73  
 Northumberland Liberal Members, 80  
 Norwich, Speech delivered at, 83  
 "Notes and Queries on the Irish Demand," 101  
 Nottingham, Speeches delivered at, 56, 79  
 Oaths, Legislation regarding, 12, 15, 17, 21, 22, 35, 36, 61, 63, 64, 66, 70, 85, 580-600  
 O'Brien, Mr. P., Arrest of, 79  
 Obstruction, Rules dealing with, 60  
 Occasional Sermons Bill, 51  
 O'Connell, Daniel, 7  
 "Odes of Horace, The, translated by W. E. Gladstone," 104  
 "Office and Work of the Old Testament in Outline, The," 103  
 Offices and Oaths Bill, 35, 36  
 Official Salaries, 46  
 O'Kelly, Mr., 65, 70  
 Oldham, Speech delivered at, 37  
 "Olive Branch from America, An," 102  
 "Olympian Religion," 104  
 "Olympian System *versus* the Solar Theory, The," 99  
 "On an Infant who was Born, was Baptized, and Died on the same Day," 96  
*Oneida* (ship) 45  
 Open Spaces, 31, 36  
 Opium Traffic and Revenue, 8, 44, 62, 88  
 Ordnance Estimates, 16  
 Ormskirk, Speeches delivered at, 37, 40  
 O'Sullivan, Daniel, Mayor of Cork, 41  
 Overend Gurney & Co., *v.* Regina, 42  
 Oxford, Abolition of Tests, 29, 32, 36  
 "Oxford and Cambridge, Commission of Enquiry into the State of the Universities of," Speech, 92  
 Oxford and Cambridge Education Bill, 36  
 Oxford and Cambridge Mission in Central Africa, 24  
 Oxford and Cambridge, Professors of, 13  
 Oxford and Cambridge, Universities of, Bill, 65  
 Oxford, Petition for Abolition of Tests at Oxford, 29  
 Oxford, Speeches delivered at, 21, 31, 57, 83  
 Oxford, Romanes Lecture, 87  
 Oxford University Bill, 17, 18, 19  
 Oxford University, Defeated at, 32  
 Pacifico, Don, Debate, 13, 109-154  
 Packet Contracts, 23  
*Pall Mall Gazette*, 51  
 Palmerston, Lord, 13, 32, 34, 57, 82, 109-154  
 Papal See, 67  
 Paper Duty Repeal, 14, 24, 25, 31  
 Paris, Declaration of, 46  
 —, Entry of Germans into, 46  
 —, Exhibition, 35  
 —, Speeches delivered at, 35, 82

# INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS 661

- Paris, Treaty of (1856), 46, 55  
 Parker, Dr., 78  
 Parks Regulation Bill, 37  
 Parks, Right of Public Meeting, 36  
 Parliament, Abridgement of Rights of, 61  
 —, Irish, 55  
 —, Right to Interfere in Colonial Matters, 12  
 Parliaments, Shorter, 82  
 Parliamentary Affirmation, 62  
 — Boroughs, 37  
 — Elections Bill, 44  
 — and Municipal Elections Bill, 40, 41, 48, 49  
 " — Oaths." Speech, 100  
 — Oaths Act (1866) Amendment Bill, 61, 70, 580-600  
 — Reform, 31, 32, 33, 35, 66  
 " — Reform in 1866," Speeches, 95  
 Parliamentary Under - Secretary Bill, 80  
 Parnell, Mr.; Arrest of, 65, 66; 69, 75, 83, 84  
 Parnell Commission, 80, 83  
 " Parnell Commission, The, and the Vote of Censure upon Irish Members, 1890," 103  
 Parnellism and Crime, 78  
 Parochial Councils Bill, 44, 46  
 Partnership, Law of, 10  
 " Past and Present Administrations, The," 94  
 Pathhead, Speech delivered at, 61  
 " Paths of Honour and of Shame, The," 99  
 Patronage of Benefices (Church of England), 63  
 Payment of Members, 43, 80, 81  
 " Peace to Come, The," 98  
 Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill, 43  
 Peebles, Speech delivered at, 61  
 Peel, Sir Robert, 13, 15, 16  
 Peel Banquet, 7  
 Peel, Mrs., Death of, 84  
 Peers, Interference of, 77  
 —, Representative, 51  
 —, Representative, Bill, 41  
 —, Speech on the conduct of the, 6  
 Penjdeh, Russian Occupation of, 74  
 Penmaenmawr, Speeches delivered at, 68, 90  
 Pensions : Civil Officers, 40, 41; Civil Officers (Pension) Bill, 42; Officers of House of Lords, 31; Perpetual, 79, 81; Penycuik, Speeches delivered at, 61, 87  
 People, Representation of the, Bill, 23, 25, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 342-379  
 Perpetual Pensions, 79, 81  
 Persia, 19, 21  
 Personal Explanation, 21, 66  
 " Personal Recollections of Arthur H. Hallam," 105  
 Perth, Speeches delivered at, 60, 73  
 " Phœnicia and Greece," 95  
 " Phœnician Affinities of Ithaca," 102  
 Phœnix Park, Riots in, 48  
 " Piracy in Borneo and the Operations of July, 1849," 98  
 Piracy, Rajah Brookes' measure of suppressing, 14  
 Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World, The, 32  
 " Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World, the," Address, 95  
 " Place of Heresy and Schism in the Modern Christian Church, The," 104  
 " Place of Homer in Classical Education and in Historical Inquiry, On the," 94  
 " Place of Homer in Education, The," 93  
 " Place of Homer in History and in Egyptian Chronology, The," 96  
 " Plain Facts relative to Corn Law Repeal," 92  
 " Plain Speaking on the Irish Union," 102  
 " Platform, its Rise and Progress, The," 104  
 Plymouth, Speeches delivered at, 56, 82  
 Poland, 29  
 Police Methods, Ireland and, 79  
 Political Changes During Half Century, 71  
 — Economy, 82  
 — Prisoners (Ireland), 43  
 — Situation at various dates, 7, 32, 60, 61, 70, 73, 75, 78, 80, 83

- "Political Situation (in Ireland)," Speech, 101  
 "Political Speeches in Scotland," 100  
 Politics and Literature, 59  
 Politics of the Past and Future, 73  
 Poor, Education of the, Bill, 37  
 Poor Law, 7  
 Poor Law Expenditure, 33  
 Pope, The—Letter of Mr. Gladstone, 46  
 Port Sunlight, Speech delivered at, 85  
 Portal, Sir Gerald, 87  
 Positive Religious Teaching, 49  
 Post Office, 28; Savings Bank, 25, 26, 28; Sunday Labour, 46; Telegraphs, 52  
 Postage—Ireland, 41  
 Postal Contracts, Galway, 26  
 Postal Subsidies, 25  
 Prayer Book Bill, 47  
 Preaching, 55  
 Preface to Miss Mackenzie's "Introductory Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey in Europe," 98  
 Preface to Dr. Schlieman's "Narrative of Discoveries at Mycenæ," 99  
 Preferential Duties for Colonial Goods, 8  
 Press, Cheap, 32  
 Press, Free, 18  
 Press Law, Indian, 57  
 Prerogative of the Crown, 59  
 "Present Aspect of the Church," 91  
 Preston, Speech delivered at, 40  
 Prince Consort, Death of, 27  
 Principles on which Income Tax is Levied, 27  
 Prisoners, Political (Ireland), 43  
 Prisons, 7  
 Private Bill Procedure, 10  
 Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Bill, 85  
 Privilege, 55, 59, 63, 68, 78, 80, 90; Mr. John Bright, 70; Mr. P. Egan, 64; Mr. O'Kelly, 70; Mr. Parnell, 66; The Speaker, 56; Dr. Tanner, 78; Bread of, 48, 86; Bread of—*Pall Mall Gazette*, 51; *The World Newspaper*, 63  
 Privy Council, Judicial Committee of, 48  
 Pr Money, Kertch and Yenikale, 2  
 "Probability as the Guide of Conduct," 99  
 Probate and Legacy Duties, 15, 25  
 Probates of Wills, etc., 60  
 Procedure, 38, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 77, 79, 84  
 Proceedings of the House—Privilege, 59  
 "Proem to Genesis: a Plea for a Fair Trial," 101  
 "Professor Huxley and the Swine-miracle," 103  
 Professors of Oxford and Cambridge, 13  
 Profit-sharing, 85  
 Progress, Fifty Years of, 85  
 Property Tax, 25  
 "Prospects Political and Financial," 93  
 Prosperity, National, 37  
 Protection, 10, 19, 86  
 Protection of Life, etc. (Ireland) Bill, 47  
 Protection of Person and Property (Ireland) Bill, 63, 64, 66  
 Proudfoot, Lavelle *v.*, 42  
 Provincial Art Galleries and Museums, 67  
 Prussia, 23, 34, 45, 46  
 "Psalms, The," 103  
 "Psalter with a Concordance, The," 104  
 Public Accounts, Audit of, 42  
 Public Affairs, 7, 42, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 68, 70, 71, 73, 89  
 — Buildings, 27  
 — Expenditure, 32, 40, 57  
 — Expenditure, condemns Extravagance in, 27  
 — Houses (Ireland), 54  
 — Lands and Buildings, 30  
 — Meeting, Right of, 36  
 — Monies, 15, 19, 27  
 — Petitions, 54  
 — Schools, 27, 43  
 — Schools Commission, 30  
 — Worship Regulation Bill, 53  
 Qualification for Office Abolition Bill, 28  
 Quarantine, 10  
 Queen Victoria's Reign, 79  
 Queen, Address to the, 11  
 Queen, Attempt on Life of, 66

- Queen Dowager, Funeral of the, 14  
 "Queen Elizabeth and the Church of England," 102  
 Queen's Speeches, *see* Address, Debates on the  
 Queen's University, 34, 36  
 "Question of Divorce, The," 103  
 "Questions constitutionnelles (1873-1878). Le trône et le Prince-époux.—Le cabinet et la constitution. Par W. E. Gladstone . . . Traduit de l'anglais et précédé d'une introduction par Albert Gigot . . ." 100  
 Railways, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 28, 90; Bill for the better regulation of, 8; Canada Railway Loan, 35, 42; Channel Tunnel, 79; Cheap Train Services, 29; Commissioners, 11; Enterprise, 73, 87; Euphrates Valley, 21; Government Commission, 31; Government Control, 80; Hours of Labour, 86; Ireland, 47, 51, 66; Irish Railway System, 31; Railways (Ireland) Bill, 34; State Purchase of Irish Railway, 51, 66  
 Rates Bill, 42, 51  
 Rates, Compounding of, 38  
 Rates on Government Property, 33  
 Ratho, Speech delivered at, 61  
 Real Estate Intestacy Bill, 41  
 "Recent Corroborations of Scripture from the Regions of History and Natural Science, On the," 103  
 Redistribution, 33, 34, 74  
 Redruth, Speech delivered at, 82  
 Reform Bills, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 40, 71, 74, 342-379  
 Reform Bill (Scotland), 36  
 Regimental Exchanges Bill, 53  
 Regina v. Overend Gurney & Co., 42  
 Registration Bill, 39, 75  
 "Rejoinder on Authority in Matters of Opinion," 98  
 "Religion, Achaian and Semitic," 100  
 Religious Denominations (Scotland), 58  
 Religious Disabilities Removal Bill, 85  
 Religious Education, 8  
 Religious Teaching in Elementary Schools, 44  
 Religious Teaching, Positive, 49  
 Religious Worship Bill, 24  
 "Remarks on the Royal Supremacy, as it is defined by Reason, History, and the Constitution." A letter to the . . . Bishop of London, 92  
 "Reply of Achilles to the Envoys of Agamemnon, The," 96  
 "Reply to Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity," 102  
 "Reply to Dr. Ingram, A," 102  
 Reporters, Exclusion of, 44  
 Representation of the People Bill, 23, 25, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 72, 73, 74, 342-379  
 Representation of the People Amendment Bill, 42, 44  
 Representation of People (Ireland) Bill, 38, 39  
 Representation of People (Scotland) Bill, 38, 39  
 Representative Government, 76  
 Representative Peers' Bill, 41  
 Representatives Abroad, Power of, 63  
 Resignation of Government, 75  
 Resignation of Ministers, 34, 51  
 Retford, Speech delivered at, 84  
 Revenue and Consolidated Fund: Charges, 16, 17  
 Revenue Officers' Bill, 41, 43  
 Revenue Officers' Disabilities Removal Bill, 39  
 Rhodope Commission, 59  
 Rhyl, Speech delivered at, 58  
 Rich, Duty of, to the Poor, 20  
 Ritualism, 40  
 "Ritualism and Ritual," 96  
 "Robert Elsmere and the Battle of Belief," 102  
 Robinson, Sir Spencer, 46  
 Roebuck, Mr., 18  
 Roman Catholics, 35  
 Roman Catholics and Appointments, 69  
 Roman Catholic Relief Bill, 11  
 Roman Catholic Relief Act Amendment, 23  
 "Roman State, from 1815 to 1850." By Luigi Carlo Farini. Translated from the Italian, 93  
 Romanes Lecture, Oxford, 87  
 "Romanes Lecture, The, 1892," 104

# 664 INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

- Rome, Diplomatic Relations with, 12
- "Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion. Three tracts. The Vatican Decrees.—Vaticanism.—Speeches of the Pope," 97 ; Danish Translation, 97 ; German Translation, 97
- Romsey, Speech delivered at, 39, 82
- Roumania, 33
- Royal Family, Grants to, 82
- Royal Literary Fund, 23
- Royal Parks, 48, 65
- "Royal Supremacy, Extracted from a Letter . . . to the . . . Bishop of London, Historical Remarks on the," 95
- Royal Titles Bill, 54
- Rules of the House, 38
- Rum, East India, 8
- Rural Life, 90
- Rural Reform, 85
- Russell, Lord John, 8, 19, 34
- Russia, 57 ; Assassination of Emperor of, 63 ; Agreement on Afghan Boundary Dispute, 75 ; Navigation Laws, 10 ; Occupation of Penjdeh, 74 ; Persecution of Jews in, 66
- "Russia and England," 100
- "Russia, Speech on the War with," 93
- "Russian Policy and Deeds in Turkistan," 77
- Russo-Turkish Question, 16
- St. Alban's, Assignment of set, 14
- St. Austell, Speech delivered at, 82
- St. Helens, Speech delivered at, 39, 40
- Salaries of County Court Judges, 19
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, 53, 55, 56, 57, 72
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Wales), 64
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill, 38
- "Sale and Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill," Speech, 101
- Salisbury, Speech delivered at, 35
- Saltney, Chester, Speech delivered at, 83
- Sardinia, Cession of, 26
- Sardinia, Military Convention with, 18
- "Sardinia and Rome," 93
- Savings Banks, 16, 18, 24, 25, 53, 62 ; Post Office, 25, 26
- Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, Duke of, Annuity to, 90
- Scheldt Toll, 29
- Schleswig-Holstein, 29, 30
- School Boards, 52
- Schools, Public, 37, 43
- Schools, Religious Teaching in Elementary, 44
- Science and Art Collections, 31
- Science, The Pursuit of, 27
- "Sclavonic Provinces of the Ottoman Empire, The," 98
- Scott, Sir Walter, 37
- "Scotch Ecclesiastical Affairs," 92
- Scotch Presbyterian Ministers, 58
- Scotland : Bank Acts, 29 ; Bank Notes Bill, 30 ; Bishops, 20 ; Church Patronage, 51 ; Church Patronage Bill, 53 ; Disestablishment of the Church, 76, 83 ; Rome Rule, 81, 84, 86 ; Home Rule Movement, 78 ; Local Government Bill, 82 ; Parliamentary Business, 48 ; Private Bill Procedure Bill, 85 ; Reform Bill, 36 ; Religious Denominations, 58 ; Representation of People Bill, 39 ; Universities Bill, 22
- "Scriptures and Modern Criticism, The," 105
- Seaside Resorts, 90
- Seats, Assignment of (St. Albans and Sudbury), 14 ; Redistribution of, Bill, 33, 34 ; Vacating of, Bill, 40
- Secret Service Money, 45, 47
- "Senti, senti, anima mia," 100
- "Session and its Sequel, The," 95
- Servian Relief Fund, 55
- Sessional Orders, 77
- Sewage in Towns, 77
- Shaftesbury, Speech delivered at, 82
- "Sheridan," 104
- "Shield of Achilles, The," 96
- Shipping Federation, 88
- Shire Oaks, Speech delivered at, 32
- Siberian Atrocities, 83
- Sicily, 28
- Simple Habits, Value of, 55
- Singleton Abbey, Speech delivered at, 78
- "Sixteenth Century Arraigned before the Nineteenth, The," 99
- Slavery, 6, 7, 10, 13, 55
- "Slicing of Hector, The," 99

# INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS 665

- Small Holdings, 86, 90  
 Smith, Adam, "Wealth of Nations," 54  
 Social Science Association, 39  
 Social Legislation, 32  
 Solicitors Certificate Duty, 15  
 "Soliloquium and Postscript, a letter to the Archbishop of York," 105  
 Soudan, The, 71, 72, 74, 75  
 "Soudan and Afghanistan. The Vote of Credit," Speech, 101  
 South Africa, 60, 61  
 South Sea Annuities, 15, 16  
 Southampton, Speech delivered at, 82  
 Southern Confederacy, Recognition of the, 29  
 Southport, Speeches delivered at, 37, 40, 82  
 Spain—Choice of a King, 45, 51  
 Spanish Treaties and Colonial Sugar, 11  
 Spanish Wines, 68  
 Speaker, Election of, 32, 48, 52, 72, 75, 77  
 Speaker, The—Privilege, 56  
 Speaker, The, and Mr. Conybeare, 88  
 "Special Aspects of the Irish Question, 104  
 Special Commission Report, 83  
 "Speeches and Public Addresses of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., The," 104  
 "Speeches and Addresses delivered at the Election of 1865," 95  
 "Speeches delivered . . . at Leeds, 1881," 100  
 "Speeches in South-West Lancashire, October, 1868," 95  
 "Speeches delivered at Warrington, Ormskirk, Liverpool, Southport, Newton, and Lancashire, in October, 1868," 95  
 "Speeches of Pope Pius IX," 96  
 Spencer, Lord, 74  
 Spirit Duties, 30, 75  
 Stade Tolls, 9  
 Stamp Duties, 17  
 Standing Committees, 71, 72  
 Standing Orders, 11  
 Stansfield, Mr., 30  
 "State in its Relations with the Church," 91; German Translation, 91.  
 State-Aided Emigration, 43  
 Statistics, Electoral, 33  
 Statute Law, Revision of the, 42  
 Stepney, Speech delivered at, 20  
 Stirling, Speech delivered at, 73  
 Stock Certificates to Bearer, 28  
 Stonehaven, Speech delivered at, 73  
 Stonor, Appointment of Mr., 17  
 Stowe, Speech delivered at, 61  
 Strike, Dock, 82  
 "Stroomingen van het godsdienstig denken, De. . . . Uit het Engelsch, met een inleiding door D. C. Nijhoff," 98  
 "Studies subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler," 105  
 Suakin, Soudan, 72, 81  
 Succession Duties, 15, 16, 18  
 Sudbury (Assignment of Seats), 14  
 Suez Canal, 22, 54, 67, 71  
 Suffragan Bishops, 43  
 Suffrage, Female, 47, 72  
 Sugar Duties, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 21, 26, 30, 32, 34, 35  
 Sugar Planters, speech in defence of West Indian, 7  
 Suleiman Sami, Trial of, 70  
 Sunday Labour (Post Office), 46  
 Sunday, Sale of Liquors on, Bill, 38  
 Sunderland, Speech delivered at, 28  
 Superannuation Act, 21, 23  
 Supply, 6, 25, 34, 42, 50, 51, 52, 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 82, 86  
 Swansea, Speech delivered at, 78  
 Syria, 62  
  
*Talisman*, Steamship, 54  
 Tanner, Dr.—Privilege, 78  
 Tariff, French General, 64, 65  
 Taunton, Speech delivered at, 55  
 Taxation, Direct and Indirect, 30, 51  
 —, Imperial, 72  
 — (Ireland), 29  
 — of Land, 85  
 —, Local, 40, 43, 46, 50, 66, 70, 72, 85  
 —, Local, Duties Bill, 83, 84  
 Taxes Bill, Collection of, 29, 30  
 Taylor, Alleged outrage on, 27  
 Tea Duties, 20, 21, 26  
 Telegraphic Contracts, 24  
 Telegraphs, Electric, Bill, 39  
 Tenants' Relief Bill (Ireland), 77  
 "Tennyson's Poems," 94  
 Tenure of Land (Ireland) Bill, 34  
 Tenure of Land (Wales) Bill, 86, 87

# 666 INDEX TO LIST OF SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

- Tenure of Town Houses (Ireland) Bill, 76
- Terminable Annuities Bill, 33
- Tests, Abolition of (Oxford), 29, 32, 36
- Tests, University, Bill, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 62
- Tests, University (Dublin) Bill, 49, 51
- Thames Embankment, 45
- "Theses of Erasmus and the Scottish Church Establishment, The," 92
- Thrift, 29, 57, 84
- Times, The*, 78, 81, 83
- Tipperary Election, 42
- Tipperary Trials, 85
- Tithes and Church (Ireland) Bill, 6
- Tobacco Duties, 28
- Toll, Scheldt, 29
- Tolls, Stade, 9
- Torquay, Speech delivered at, 82
- Tory Finance, 60
- Trade Unions, Deputation from London, 37
- "Translation of Horace, Od. iii. 9, 'Donec gratus.'" 94
- "Translations by Lord Lyttelton and the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone," 94
- Transvaal, Annexation of the, 63 ; Boer Invasion of Bechuanaland, 69
- Transvaal Rising, 65
- Treasury, 12
- Treaties of 1855 and 1871, 58
- "Treatment of the Irish Members and the Irish Political Prisoners, The Speech," 102
- "Triple Alliance and Italy's Peace in it, The," By Ontidanos, 103
- Trinity College, Dublin, 30
- "True and False Conception of the Atonement, The," 104
- Truro, Speech delivered at, 82
- Tunis, 64
- Turkey, 16, 19, 29, 55, 57, 58, 61, 62, 70
- Uganda, 87
- Ulster, 77, 86
- Unbelief, 50
- Unfunded Debt, The, 18
- Uniformity, Act of, 18, 29
- Uniformity Act Amendment Bill, 36
- Union Chargeability Bill, 31
- Union Relief Aid Acts Continuance Bill, 29
- Unions, Medical Officers in (Ireland), 31
- United States, *see* America, United States of
- "Universitas Hominum, or Unity of History," 102
- "University of Edinburgh, Inaugural Address delivered before the," 94
- University Education (Ireland) Bill, 32, 50, 59, 426-469
- "University Education in Ireland, Speech on Bill relating to," 96
- University Elections Bill, 26
- University Extension, 22
- "University of Glasgow, Inaugural Address," 99
- University Tests, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 62
- University Tests (Dublin) Bill 47, 49, 51
- Universities (Ireland) Bill, 82
- Universities (Scotland) Bill, 22
- Universities, History of, 87
- Universities, Manufacturing Towns and the, 21
- Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill, 56, 65
- Universities, Work of, 24
- Unlawful Assemblies (Ireland) Bill, 49
- Unofficial Members' Business, 87
- Usury Laws, Repeal of, 18
- Vacating of Seats Bill, 40
- Vaccination Law (Penalties) Bill, 57
- Van Diemen's Land, 13
- Vancouver's Island, 12
- "Vatican Decrees, The," 97 ; French Translation, 97 ; Italian Translation, 97 ; Spanish Translation, 97
- "Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance : a Political Expostulation, The," 96
- Vatican Diplomatic relations with, 12, 67
- "Vaticanism : an Answer to Replies and Reproofs," 97 ; Italian Translation, 97
- Vienna Conferences, 18
- Vienna, Negotiations at, 19
- Villiers, Mr., 10

- "Vindication of Home Rule, A,"  
104  
Volunteer Movement, 25, 31  
Votes of Censure, 53, 65, 71, 72,  
74, 87  
Votes of Credit, 57, 68, 72, 73, 75  
Wakefield, Speech delivered at, 48  
Wakefield, Writ, 26  
Wales, Prince of, 28, 54; Prin-  
cess of, 39; Education, 59;  
English Feeling towards, 81;  
Established Church Bill, 87;  
Home Rule, 81; Home Rule  
Movement, 78; Intermediate  
Education Bill, 81; Local  
Government Bill, 89, 90; Sale  
of Intoxicating Liquors, 64;  
Tenure of Land Bill, 86, 87  
Walsall, speech delivered at, 8  
Warrington, Speech delivered at,  
40  
Washington, Treaty of, 49, 51  
War and Finance, 17  
"War in China." Speech, 93  
"War in Italy," 94  
War, Commerce and, 32  
War, Evils of, 16  
"War and Negotiations, the,"  
Speech, 93  
"War and the Peace," 93  
Watchmaking by Machinery, 9  
Wavertree, Speech delivered at, 40  
Ways and Means, 18, 20, 23, 26, 27,  
29, 30, 31, 33, 38, 46, 47, 51, 53,  
58, 59, 66, 72, 74, 78, 79, 81, 86  
Wedgwood—Speech at Burslam, 29  
"Wedgwood: an Address," 94  
Weighing of Grain (Port of London)  
Bill, 30  
Wellington College, 59, 60  
"Wellington College, Speech at,"  
99  
Werneth, Speech delivered at, 37  
Wesleyans, 84  
West Calder, Speeches delivered at,  
60, 61, 75, 84, 86  
West Indian Sugar Planters, Speech  
in defence of, 7  
West Meath—Unlawful Combina-  
tions (Ribandism), 46  
Westminster, Palace of, 44  
Westmoreland—Lord Lieutenant,  
41  
Wetherall, Sir E., 40  
Weymouth, Speech delivered at, 82  
Whitby, Speech delivered at, 48  
Widnes, Speech delivered at, 40  
Wigan, Speeches delivered at, 40, 60  
Wilks, Mr. Washington, 22  
Wills, Probates of, 60  
Winchester College, Speech de-  
livered at, 71  
Wine Duties and Licences, 15, 24,  
25, 26, 68, 80  
Wirral, Speeches delivered at, 73, 85  
Witnesses (House of Commons), 41  
Wolseley, Lord (Annuity Bill), 70  
Women, Education of, 84  
Woman, Suffrage, 47, 72  
Women's Disabilities Bill, 44, 47  
Woolwich, Speech delivered at, 52,  
58  
Worcestershire, East, Election, 38  
Workhouse, Address to Inmates  
of St. Pancras, 60  
Working Classes, 83, 84, 88  
Working Wen's Club, 49  
"Workman and his Opportunities,  
The," 103  
"Works of Bishop Butler," 105  
*World, The* Newspaper—Privilege,  
63  
Wrexham, Speeches delivered at  
28, 81  
Yenikale, Kertch and, Prize Money,  
27  
York, Duke of, Marriage of, 89  
York, Speech delivered at, 28  
Yorkshire Liberal Members, 77  
Zante, Speech delivered at, 23  
Zulu War, 59

Printed in Great Britain by  
Butler & Tanner, Frome and London.







